

15
LIBRARY
OF THE
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.
GIVEN BY

The Genesis of the Republican Party.

By JOSIAH HARTZELL.



CAGE
JK 2357
1890
.H37

The Genesis of the Republican Party.

CHAPTER I.

Constitutional Aspects of Slavery and the Attitude of the Republican Party thereto.

A completed house implies many preliminary steps. It may, in certain aspects, be taken as an indication of the habits of its owner, of his capacity for business, or of his industry, and of his economy, and his thrift in disposing of the fruits of his industry. It implies a struggle for means, a desire for a home, a design, a plan, a contract. On the part of the contractor it implies the requisite skill, the needed excavations; then the walls and roof. Not until these last named are reared to their places have the labors and ideas of the householder taken such shape and form before the world as to admit of an intelligent judgment on their merits. The form and outline of the Republican house were fully completed and first exposed to the country only in the year 1856. It is my purpose to recall, and to present to the attention of the reader, in as concise terms as possible, the several political events and conditions which culminated in the erection of the Republican house.

The formation of the Republican party was the result of an organized effort for the purpose of preventing the extension of slavery. It is true that other reforms were espoused and enunciated, such as free speech, free press, and the inviolability of the mails; reforms that were rendered necessary only by the barbarities of slavery. Also internal improve-

ments, anti-polygamy and others; but all these were subordinate and of little weight compared with the great overshadowing issue of slavery. The abolition of slavery in the states where it existed never constituted any part of the Republican program. The military situation which necessitated the destruction of the slave system was brought about by the direct aggressions of the slave power. The history of Republican beginnings is therefore one and the same with the later history of that political struggle which ended with the extinction of the slave system in the United States.

It is not my intention to write a history of slavery, or even to refer to any phases of the subject other than those in which it constituted a political force. The fathers of the Republic found slavery in existence in nearly all of the original thirteen states. They were not responsible for its introduction. It was a heritage of British rule.

At the time of the adoption of the federal constitution the moral sentiment of the leaders of public opinion was most adverse to slavery. The anathemas hurled against it by Jefferson are familiar to every one. Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, Patrick Henry, Adams and nearly all the prominent men of that day are on record against it—it had no open defenders. But, from time immemorial, the teachings of men have been better than their practice. Many of these very men, including the Father of his Country, were slave-holders. Very many of these slaves were acquired by inheritance, and emancipation by a testamentary pro-

vision was frequent. Washington's example in this respect will not be forgotten.

So universal was the feeling against slavery by the people of that day, so far as any feeling was given expression to, that the notion prevailed that, in some vague, indefinite way, the institution would by and by run out—cease to exist. The wish was father to the thought. Very few persons concerned themselves practically about well directed means to that end. An unfortunate result of this lack of organized effort was the indirect recognition—but the recognition—of the existence of slavery in the constitution. The constitution did not reserve to the federal government the right to control in matters of that character. These powers were given to the states.

Such was the constitutional ground taken by the Republican party on its organization, viz: non-interference by the government with slavery in the states where it existed, and limitation to those states. The Democratic party took the ground that slavery should not be limited to certain states, but, either in the form of slaveholding or slave-hunting, should be co-extensive with the national territory.

But although a form of government had been organized, the precise terms of the compact were not settled until the Philadelphia convention in 1787. On that occasion Jefferson offered a clause providing that slavery should not exist after the year 1800. In view of the sinfulness of the practice, he said "he trembled for his country when he remembered that God was just." The delegates from South Carolina and Georgia declared their intention of seceding from the Union if the clause was adopted. As finally agreed upon, the ordinance prescribed that the slave trade should stop within twenty years, and that slaves should never be held in the territory northwest of the Ohio river. This was in the nature of a compromise, but freedom was the aggressor. Limits were placed upon the institution which had not before existed.

With the subsequent aggrandizement of slavery it became apparently certain that the framers of the constitution had erred in not providing for its extinction. I say apparently, because a more positive reflection upon the action of those men is unwarranted. The reader is, or ought to be, fresh from the contemplation of the events of that period. Only last spring the one hundredth anniversary of the final adoption of the constitution was celebrated throughout the

land. A moment's thought will recall the difficulties that beset the situation in 1788 and 1789. Not in the darkest days of the rebellion was the Union in greater danger of going to pieces than in that era. Without the constitution as a bond of Union, all that had been gained for freedom by the trials of the revolution would have been lost—certain States were already on the eve of assuming prerogatives of sovereignty. To avert so dire a catastrophe required the most self-sacrificing efforts on the part of the ablest men, Alexander Hamilton being easily first. But he would probably have failed but for the great influence of Washington. Next in order Jefferson and John Adams merit the gratitude of posterity.

Two questions arise: Would it have been possible to have had the constitution accepted without the three-fifths clause, recognizing the existence of slavery; and, had the constitution not been adopted by reason of omitting said clause would slavery have been a loser thereby? Recorded events answer the first question negatively. Every attempt to answer the second must be largely speculative. All previous experience taken together make it extremely probable that a failure to adopt, and abide by, the new constitution would have resulted in the division of the territory of the Union between contending factions, which in their turn, would have lapsed back into the embrace of the mother country. In that case slavery might, and possibly would, have been abolished thirty years sooner than it was, viz. in 1833, when slavery was abolished throughout the British empire, but the cause of republican liberty would have been relegated to indefinite abeyance. Vaticinations of this nature are not without a certain sort of interest, but history must concern itself with what did happen, and not what might have happened.

These few observations upon the constitutional aspects of slavery are presented because it is important not at any time to lose sight of the fact that the Republican party always adhered to constitutional measures. It is true that its leaders hated slavery. It is true that, at a later day, when it had got complete control of the Democratic organization, and the latter had violated every compact that limited slave domination, James G. Birney had expressed the conviction that "Liberty and slavery cannot live in juxtaposition;" that Seward had styled it an "irrepressible conflict" that would not cease until the nation became entirely free-labor or

slaveholding; that Lincoln had expressed his conviction that the Union could not survive half slave and half free.

In the light of history the sayings of prominent Republican leaders, above quoted, may be regarded as prophetic. Their real weight and greatest importance was due to the fact that they voiced the average conscience of the country. No impartial observer could contemplate the lengths to which the Democracy of that day was willing to go in its subserviency to the slave power and resist the conclusion that, if that course was persisted in, the nation could not much longer exist half slave and half free.

Although these personal dictums were diligently employed to make it appear that the new Republican party favored disunion, the latter idea derived no color of support from any official declaration of the party. Loyalty to the Union, non-interference with slavery where it constitutionally existed, and restriction, were the characterizing spirit of its State and National platforms. Even after rebel states had commenced seceding, in his first inaugural, which was also the last official declaration of Republican policy before the outbreak of the war, Mr. Lincoln used these words: "I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution has passed Congress to the effect that the Federal Government shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of the States, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconception of what I have said, I now depart from my purpose, not to speak of particular amendments, so far as to say that holding such a provision to now be implied constitutional law, I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable."

The clause to which Mr. Lincoln referred as "implied constitutional law" is contained in Art. 1, Sec. 2 of the Constitution, and reads as follows: "Representatives shall be apportioned among

the several States according to their respective numbers which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

These words, "three-fifths of all other persons," constitute the only legal sanction for the existence of slavery contained in the organic law of the Union. The rights of individuals, the rights of states, the powers of the government are clearly defined, but the subject of human servitude which, more than any other, was to absorb public attention during the next half century, received only this bare mention. The fathers were evidently ashamed of slavery; but its existence was recognized and the measure of its representative power was fixed. Its restriction was possible only by state action, or, in the case of territories, by law of Congress. Fidelity to the Union and the Constitution involved acquiescence to this interpretation. In future chapters we shall see that a great political power was built up for the aggrandizement of slavery. We shall also see that a no less formidable party was animated by the desire and with the purpose of opposing this aggrandizement and of placing restrictions upon the spread of the evil.

In America sovereignty is lodged, not with a family of hereditary princes, but with the people. Their pledge of obedience is not to kings and queens, but to the Constitution and to laws which they themselves have ordained. Men have differed in opinion and will continue to do so. Two great parties composed of millions of voters dispute the power and patronage of the Republic. But, with the single exception of the slaveholder's rebellion, our one hundred and fourteen years of National history has not witnessed any serious menace to the Constitution and the cause of popular government.

CHAPTER II.

Invention of the Cotton Gin and Its Immediate Sequences.

It will facilitate a correct understanding of the successive steps by which the slave interest rose to supreme power if we divide the period under consideration into two parts. The first comprises so much of our national history as ante-

dates the administration of Andrew Jackson. The second period extends from Jackson to the Emancipation Proclamation. During the first period freedom was the aggressive party; during the second period slavery was the ag-

gressor. The aggressions of slavery called the Republican party into existence—it was always, prior to the war, a party of defense.

It does not disprove the assertion that, up to 1830, freedom was the aggressive influence, to admit that during that period slavery flourished and slaves multiplied in the slave states in a rapidly increasing ratio. This was due not only to no lack of effort on the part of those friendly to abolition, but to a cause which most powerfully appealed to the selfish instincts of mankind. It was not the first time in the world, nor the last, that the peaceful crusades of morality have been overpowered by the army of human greed.

In 1786 the cotton plant was first introduced into Georgia. During the first few years of its domestication upon the Western Continent, this humble immigrant gave few tokens of qualification for that career of kingly power in the support of which it was shortly to figure as one of the most formidable chiefs. Had the processes involved in preparing the cotton fiber for market always been confined to hand labor the history of the United States in the nineteenth century would have presented a picture radically different from that which we now see. For slavery might and probably would have been extinguished. The diffusion of freedom and education would have made the South homogeneous with the North. There would have been no solid South and no war.

But in 1793 Eli Whitney, a New Englander by birth, invented the cotton gin. The discovery of this small machine, doing the work of a hundred hands in separating the seeds from the fiber, opened an era of financial prosperity in the cotton states surpassing the wildest dreams. British manufacturers were always eager to take all the staple that could be produced and pay very remunerative prices therefor. For the first time the United States became an export nation, her sole commodity being cotton, the gold received in exchange going exclusively into the coffers of the cotton planters. This wealth in turn conferred power and gave a not doubtful significance to that oft repeated metaphor, "Cotton is King." Nourished by this influx of gold, slavery waxed in strength from year to year. Not only so, but with each succeeding year it put on new phases of shameless cruelty, until at length, as every reader of Uncle Tom's Cabin knows, it assumed the proportions of the most atrocious crime recorded in ancient or modern history.

The deplorable condition of the cotton and sugar slaves was due to the withdrawal from them of every comfort and privilege which distinguishes humanity from the beasts of the field. Their welfare, their family ties, even their lives were regarded in the same light as those of cattle. One consideration dominated all—the securing of the largest profits. The master seldom saw his slaves. He luxuriated in the cities, in Europe, or in the congenial politics of home. Overseers, whose rate of compensation was conditioned upon the net product of the plantation, ruled the unhappy colony with a rigor that had no parallel in the heart of Africa.

The development of these new phases in the cotton belt produced a great demand for slaves, and this demand more than doubled their price. As natural multiplication, with its embarrassments, was restricted by the new conditions, the planters had to resort to the more northern markets. They maintained agencies for the purchase of slaves at principal points in Kentucky, Virginia and Maryland. In the latter states slavery had existed mainly in the so-called "patriarchal" form. When it became evident to the people of these states that their territory had degenerated to the unspeakable baseness of becoming the breeding ground for the slave supply of the cotton states their better element was aroused. A new impulse was given to anti-slavery propaganda.

This new wave of hostility to slavery flowed freely over the border slave states, as well as the North. Freedom of opinion, at least of expression, had nearly disappeared in the extreme South. But in the three states above named, and in Tennessee and North Carolina, the sinfulness of slavery, was preached, and lectured, and printed almost without restraint. I have before me a list comprising the names of 120 anti-slavery publications which appeared prior to 1830. Many of these were printed in the South, and all were freely circulated in that region. As a matter of fact public opinion at the North had, as yet, not been fully aroused. In parts of the South the agitation was intense. The practice of giving credit for all anti-slavery achievement to any one man, or set of men, which prevails in some quarters, more particularly in New England, is based upon the grossest misapprehension of truth.

A few excerpts will show that the apostleship of anti-slavery was by no means confined to a decade or two before the war, nor even to the states of the

North. I have already referred to Washington's example in emancipating his slaves. In a letter to Robert Morris he said: "There is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it." Said Jefferson: "The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such a contest." Madison said: "It is to be hoped we may destroy it and save our country from the reproach, and our posterity from the imbecility ever attendant on a country filled with slaves." Monroe said: "We have found that this evil has preyed upon the very vitals of the Union." Said Patrick Henry: "It would rejoice my very soul that every one of my fellow beings was emancipated." John Randolph's rebuke to a political lickspittle in Congress is probably familiar: "Sir, I envy neither the heart nor head of that man from the North who rises here to defend slavery." And Thomas Jefferson Randolph, of Virginia: "How can an honorable mind bear to see this Ancient Domain, rendered illustrious by the patriotism of her sons in the cause of liberty, converted into one grand menagerie, where men are to be reared for the market like oxen for the shambles?" Hear Henry Clay: "So long as God allows the vital current to flow through my veins I will never, never, never, by word or thought, by mind or will, aid in admitting one rood of free territory to the everlasting curse of human bondage." Thomas H. Benton said: "My opposition to slavery dates farther back than 1844—forty years farther back." Mason, of Virginia, said: "Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country." Pinkney said: "Iniquitous and most dishonorable to Maryland is this dreary system of bondage." Marshall, of Virginia, said: "Wherefore, then, object to slavery? Because it is ruinous to the whites." James G. Birney, of Kentucky, said: "We have so long practiced injustice in the treatment of the colored race that we begin to regard injustice as the chief element in our government. But no government which permits injustice as an element can be a permanent one."

But I must hasten on. Many large volumes would be required to print all the sayings and doings of men, and societies, and churches, and parties, all in the South, during this interesting but much neglected period in our country's history. This wave of free impulse had already rolled itself upon the treacherous shoals of slavery, and spent its force before the organization of the

Northern Anti-Slavery Society in 1832. And now, for a few moments let us gather up in review the substantial benefits to freedom which accrued as the fruit of this first period of anti-slavery agitation, and the only period during which it was an aggressive influence.

It must be borne in mind that at the formation of the Union there had been no division of territory. Slavery had no prescribed limitations. Slaves were held practically in all the states. Hostility to the practice first declared itself at the north. Vermont was the first, and New York the last state to abolish slavery. Pennsylvania acted in 1798, Massachusetts in 1803, New Jersey in 1804. Abolition in every case was effected by gradual emancipation laws, by the operation of which slavery slowly died out. So slowly, as a matter of fact that, according to the census of 1840, slaves were still reported as being held in every state excepting Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont and Michigan. This slow extinction of slavery in the north had the effect of a soporific in quieting early anxiety and agitation of the subject. Many persons argued, and believed, that one state after another would follow the example, that slavery would go out as a matter of course, and that agitation would retard rather than hasten the good work.

Another fruit of the earlier anti-slavery effort was the ordinance of 1787, by which Virginia ceded to the United States the territory now composing the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Michigan. The ordinance forbid the keeping of slaves in this territory, but provided for the return of fugitive slaves. In subsequent years the most strenuous efforts were made to repeal the anti-slavery feature of this ordinance, but unsuccessfully. The debt which these States, which now constitute the heart of the nation, owe to early champions of freedom is not a light one.

Another grand reform was the suppression of the African slave trade by act of Congress in 1808. By the terms of the compact of 1787 this step might have been postponed until the year 1817. But the unspeakable horrors of this traffic had been freely exposed by both English and French philanthropists. It was shown that not fifty per cent. of the negroes shipped at the mouth of the river Niger ever reached their destinations, and that a large percentage of arrivals died lingering deaths from diseases contracted in the holds of the ships. The details of the horrors of the

middle passage were diligently published by American papers. The outraged consciences of citizens of the Republic at length demanded the cessation of the traffic with such energy that no other course was left, and the law against the importation of slaves was passed.

With shackles broken from the slave in twelve states, with slavery established by law in no single state, with the consecration of the Northwestern territory to free labor, with the suppression of the slave trade, with free speech

and free press, and with thousands of papers, preachers and speakers denouncing slavery as an insufferable disgrace to our newly established Republic, the future of the cause of universal freedom, even as late as the year 1815, seemed most encouraging. Near triumphs were, indeed, in store for free labor, but these were not to be unmixed with a draught of bitterness. The next great act in this drama of freedom and liberty was the adoption of the Missouri Compromise.

CHAPTER III.

The Purchase of Louisiana and the Missouri Compromise

The year 1803 was a turning point in the career of the great Napoleon. Single handed, without an ally, the young republic of France had hurled back all her assailants. The hereditary sovereigns, feeling that the new democracy was a menace to their crowns, renewed the assault again and again, but with the campaign which culminated at Marengo the continental rulers stood aghast, terror-stricken. For the first time in many years a strange peace settled down upon the French nation. It is easy to imagine that a most grand career awaited that people, and that a most glorious and honorable future was assured to Napoleon had he chosen, from that on, to remain a loyal child of the Republic. On the other hand, not a year, perhaps not months even, had passed until we find him planning for war upon a gigantic scale.

One of his first steps was to sell the territory of Louisiana to the United States government. His object was twofold. First he maintained his popularity with the French people by avoidance of oppressive taxes. He was not only a conqueror but a robber. He inflicted most heartless outrages upon subjugated peoples, compelling them not only to maintain his armies but to embellish the city of Paris. In time of peace the sixty millions of francs he would receive from America for Louisiana would go a great way toward saving his dear French from unpopular taxation. All he wanted of his own people was their heart's blood. And, second, his machinations, this time, were to be directed against England. He was weak at sea, and it was not doubtful that, in view of the growing importance of American colonies, in

just as little time as British ships could fly to the Gulf of Mexico, after war was declared, Louisiana would become a possession of England. Fortunately this was the opportunity of the United States, for had that indefinable, unexplored, but really imperial domain known as Louisiana, passed into British hands, the least that could be said is that we should have had a very different customer to deal with.

Lay down a map of the United States and draw a straight line from Seattle, Washington, to New Orleans. The Louisiana of 1803 comprised all the territory east of this line as far as the Mississippi river, and an equal area, with approximately the same shape and proportions, to the west of the line. It is three times as large as France. In mineral and agricultural resources its riches are almost limitless. It is now agreed that Alaska was cheap enough at ten millions. If so, what a bagatelle was twelve millions for the Louisiana sold to us by Napoleon?

With many ups and downs of previous history, including alternate occupancy by Spain, England and France, there was one staring misfortune in the case of the New Louisiana: Slavery had got a footing there, but it was practically limited to the area which became the State of that name. The State was admitted without question as to slavery. Slavery aspired to the possession of the territory, and so did freedom.

The first advancing wave of pioneers went westward by lake and river. Upon the territory now known as the state of Missouri converged the tides of settlers borne north on the Mississippi and west on the Ohio. As early as 1817 the

people of that colony felt the need of government restraint and protection. They agreed upon a constitution and applied for admission into the Union. Non-slaveholders were as ten to one; but this one, this tenth man, had a special interest to look after; he saw to it that slavery was guaranteed by said constitution.

The people of the free states were taken by surprise. They had been dreaming of more free states; of the emancipation which had so often been predicted and promised in the border slave states.

The practice of slavery had, thus far in the history of the country, not been established by any statutory enactment. It existed only by sufferance, by common consent. But here was a young territory of splendid promise knocking at the door for admission to the Union with slavery permitted by express terms in her fundamental law. The outcry was general. No question of policy had ever stirred the Nation so before.

Population in the Northern states had increased much more rapidly than in the Southern. Keeping pace with this increase, representation in the House of Representatives from the free states predominated largely over that from the slave states. The states composing the two sections being equal numerically, the Senators were equally divided. The Missouri constitution was rejected by the House, but, with the help of several Northern votes, accepted by the Senate. The Missouri question became the most prominent topic of controversy, in Congress and throughout the country in general, during the next two years. During this time Maine also applied for admission to the Union as a free state.

As the result of all this agitation that memorable compact known as the Missouri Compromise was agreed upon and enacted in 1820. The terms of this agreement comprised the following:

1st. The admission of Maine as a free state.

2nd. The admission of Missouri as a slave state.

3rd. The following provision as part of the law which was the basis of Missouri's admission to statehood:

"In all that territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes north latitude, (the north line of Arkansas) not included within the limits of the state contemplated by this act, slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than

in the punishment of crimes, whereof the parties shall be duly convicted, shall be, and is hereby, forever prohibited."

Many writers have taken the view that the disposal of the Missouri controversy was an anti-slavery defeat. It is true that a most earnest effort was made to keep slavery out of that state, and that this effort proved abortive. On the other hand, the Louisiana acquired of France was slave territory, and it would perhaps, historically, be more correct to assume that, having gained by far the largest part of the territory to freedom by a solemn compact, the real victory was on the side of anti-slavery. It also becomes an event of the first importance by the fact that it was the last success which crowned the labors of the opponents of human bondage until the election of Abraham Lincoln. In every national contest during the next forty years, where the interests of slavery entered clearly into the issue, the party of freedom and humanity suffered continuous humiliation and defeat.

The enactment of the Missouri Compromise closes the first volume of this history, comprising the period of aggressive anti-slavery effort. Nearly all subsequent endeavor, including such as was put forth by the Republican party, was in the nature of defense against the encroachments of wrong. In order that the reader may have a clear conception of the relation of the events which I have been describing to the Republican party I will anticipate a little.

In 1854 the slave power had the National Government in its complete control. The new slave territory gained by the Mexican war had been admitted. Additional slave states must be gained or the institution would be left behind in the race for power. Then it was that Congress repealed the Missouri Compromise. This repeal was followed by the growth, the consolidation, and ultimately by the triumph of the Republican organization. Attention will now be given to some of the principle occurrences of the intervening period, including also the influences that operated, first in consolidating the slave power, and second, in such a change of conviction as to array the North almost solidly against what had long been in fact, as well as in name, the Solid South.

The year 1820, including the few years immediately succeeding it, are characterized in history as the "era of good feeling." The good President Monroe, a Southern man, was known to abhor slavery. He had promulgated the

"Monroe Doctrine," in support of which there was no dissenting voice. There had been no dissensions outside of the Missouri controversy. Two great political organizations had existed before, and were subsequently to contest for power, but at that time there was no clearly-defined division. Anti-slavery effort, quieted by the apparent definitive consecration of the great North and West to freedom, passed the subsequent decade in a state of comparative lethargic repose. Undoubtedly it was felt that time, growth, increasing intelligence, and the examples of other nations would yet somehow result in the effacement of the foul blot upon the Republic.

The partisans of the institution undoubtedly took the same view of the tendencies of the times, and at once set themselves about the work of strengthening slavery in ways that had not been dreamed of. The master minds in the interest of the South were Calhoun and Crawford. Owing to the unpopularity of slavery in the border states the sectional fight against the North had, so far, been waged mainly on the tariff issue. But the Missouri controversy had arrayed the south generally against the north, and indicated to Calhoun that the time was ripe for pitting action against that section upon the real issue of slavery. In order to inaugurate the new party movement with as much prestige as possible a master stroke was decided upon. An effort would be made to induce the states of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois to adopt slavery by a popular vote in those states.

It was arranged that the entering wedge should be Illinois. The foreign and New England element had not then possessed Illinois as at a later date. As a matter of fact the great majority of the voters in that state were immigrants

from the south. The supposition that a pro-slavery victory was possible was therefore by no means so violent as might be supposed. The proposition of the Legislature gave eighteen months in which to canvass the subject before election. The contest grew hotter and hotter day after day, and finally became so intense that a great relief was felt when the question had been decided, which took place in August, 1824. The Calhoun conspiracy was defeated by a large majority. With the example of Illinois staring them in the face, the inauguration of similar attempts in Indiana and Ohio were abandoned by the slavery propagandists.

Next in the program came their determination to possess themselves, as residuary legatees, of the Democratic party. Partisan Democracy had generally been arrayed on the side of free trade, and against the manufacturing interest. It had been rather anti-slavery than otherwise. That fact was rather regarded with favor by Calhoun, who reasoned that by seizing the party organization he would win many over to slavery merely by the force of party name, tradition and affiliation. Mr. Calhoun was one of the ablest men in the country. He was the idol of the slaveholding interest. As a statesman he was far seeing, capable and perfectly unscrupulous. Having succeeded, with the co operation of Crawford, in gaining a certain ascendancy for his new slave Democracy, it had undoubtedly entered into his dream of the future to, one day, mount into the presidential chair. If so, an impassable obstacle now barred the way, viz., the great popularity of General Jackson. Calhoun accepted the situation, consolidated his new party, and paved the way for the election of Jackson as President of the United States.

CHAPTER IV.

Andrew Jackson.

Every President from Lincoln to our present Chief Magistrate has owed his election to his war record, or to his attitude toward the country during the war. Even Mr. Cleveland need not be excepted, for had his published record evinced a spirit at any time hostile to the Union he must inevitably have been defeated. But the six Presidents immediately preceding him came into office upon impulses emanating more directly from the issues of the war.

The same remark is true of the first six Presidents of the United States, in their relation to the war, and to the duty of Congress, in that struggle which gave birth to the Republic. No lover of popular government can turn back to the record and refresh his memory with the deeds of those six men, Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and John Quincy Adams, without a feeling of the deepest gratitude to the kind Providence that fixed these wholesome examples in the early pages of our national history. Other people, only too often, may glorify merely the physical or military prowess of their chief founders—be it ours to honor those men of pure and noble lives, who both in war and in peace were animated by the spirit of true philanthropy, and the desire to perpetuate to posterity the blessings foreshadowed in their immortal Declaration.

The advent of Jackson and Calhoun to the highest offices of the nation, in 1828, was immediately followed by the introduction of a new feature in political administration. The famous rule, "To the victors belong the spoils," may have been the invention of Jackson's opponents, but it was inapt at best, and expressed only half the truth. To have been adapted exactly to the situation it should have read: To the slaveholders and to their friends belong the offices.

Undoubtedly General Jackson had been deeply stung by the conduct of the House of Representatives in 1824. He had received a majority of the popular vote, but lacking two-thirds of the electoral vote, the choice had to be made by

the Representatives, and the majority of these were from the North. They elected John Quincy Adams.

Calhoun and Crawford therefore found Jackson ripe for the purposes of their proposed coalition, which was founded on the extension and dominion of the slave power as its chief corner stone. The newly organized faction through which this coalition would seek to gain favor and power was to be called the Democratic party, partly because the mechanism of the old, ante-Monroe party of that name was already largely within their grasp, and partly because of the popularity of the name itself.

While there was perfect agreement as to the party instrumentality by which Jackson's campaign was to be operated, there is a distinction to be made in the proposed aims of the coalitionists. While General Jackson was the undisguised friend of slavery, he held to his own success, his honor and reputation, as outweighing any of the incidents or accidents that might befall slavery. Calhoun's efforts were all put forth with an eye single to the dominance of that southern oligarchy of which he was the most able champion. This dissimilitude of purpose found no pretext for its manifestation until the later years of Jackson's administration when slavery had reached a pinnacle of power such as it never enjoyed before or since that day. In view of General Jackson's prominence as a factor in those events which subsequently necessitated the formation of the Republican party, and of the evils in civil administration which must clearly be charged to his account, it is pleasant to have this occasion for showing that, at least in love for and fidelity to the Union, if in no other respect, he was worthy to be the successor of the first six Presidents of the Nation.

In 1832 a convention in South Carolina passed what is known as the "Nullification Ordinance." This act declared:

1st, That the laws of Congress imposing duties on importations into that state were null and void;

2d, That neither Federal or state officers should be allowed to collect such duties;

3d, That no appeal would be allowed to the United States Supreme court in

cases arising under the ordinance; and,

4th, That if the United States officers attempted to enforce said laws of Congress, South Carolina would hold itself absolved from farther political connection with the Union, and would forthwith proceed to organize a separate government.

It is related of General Jackson that when this treasonable manifesto was made known to him his outburst of passion was terrific. He threatened hanging, commencing with Calhoun as the most deserving of that distinction. Some of his expressions have been handed down by tradition—historians had their reasons for dispensing with exactitude in reporting the language used. He was known to be a rude talker. He never would believe that the world was round. Webster once said of him that "Jackson never could feel entirely at ease in any company as long as there was a single gentleman present." Be this as it may, and admitting that the manifestation of his impulses was more creditable to his heart than his tastes, his real conduct in the affair was all that the most ardent patriot could desire. He crushed the proposed rebellion on the spot, and none the less summarily because South Carolina was his native state, and the instigators his own personal friends. No history in the United States will be complete that does not contain his proclamation on the subject in full. He lays it down as law that the constitution forms an actual government, not simply a league between the states. It is a knock-down argument against disunion, and gave secession a quietus from which it did not revive until the lapse of nearly thirty years.

The defeat of Vice President Calhoun's treachery by the President himself resulted in a permanent personal estrangement between the two men. In the following year Calhoun surrendered his office to Martin VanBuren. He never again regained his personal prestige, but his "State rights" heresies kept on diffusing themselves, and were permanently precipitated only at Appomattox. But it is time to retrace our steps to the beginning of Jackson's administration and make brief notes of other incidents which were to have an important bearing upon the politics of the country.

General Jackson was, above all, a military man. He acted upon the principle that his office-holding army should be, like his old soldiers, obedient, under complete discipline, homogeneous. Not an anti-slavery man was left in a federal

office, North or South, at home or abroad. Another feature of the coalition program was the holding of meetings throughout the South, at which abolition and the tariff were dwelt upon in the most inflammatory style. All anti-slavery expression was terrorized into silence. Free speech and free press disappeared from the South, to be partially reinstated again only at the surrender of General Lee.

Emboldened by the possession of all the government power, and the abject submission to which all citizens of the slaveholding region had been reduced, there still remained one object to be accomplished before the new Democracy could feel that southern subjugation to slavery was perfectly complete. In July, 1835, the postmaster at Charleston, South Carolina, sounded the bugle call for a rally to accomplish this purpose in true southern style—he made a bonfire of certain newspapers received at his office on the public square of the city. It is true that on the morning of the same day this officer had written to Postmaster General Kendall for instructions, and, after the lapse of a week, had the same intimated to him in the following terms: "By no act of mine could I be induced to aid knowingly in giving circulation to papers of this description, directly or indirectly." Under such a homogeneous administration no time need be wasted in waiting for instructions if only the welfare of slavery was involved. To a complaining Virginia postmaster the postmaster general said that there was no present means of relief except in "responsibilities voluntarily assumed by postmasters;" also that "he hoped Congress, at its next session, would put a stop to the evil." To the postmaster at New York city he wrote advising him to keep anti-slavery papers out of the mails. These letters exhibit certain phases of the coalition scheme which had for its object:

1st The suppression of anti-slavery publications at the north, and

2d, Securing a law of Congress excluding all such matter from the mails.

To accomplish the first of these state action was invoked, and nearly every southern legislature passed resolutions requesting northern legislatures to pass laws making anti-slavery publications and declarations penal offenses. I make room for only the mildest of these, passed by the General Assembly of North Carolina:

"Resolved, That our sister states are requested to enact penal laws prohibi-

ing the printing of all such publications as may have a tendency to make our slaves discontented."

It is startlingly significant of the political debauchery of that day that these impudent requests were received with favor by certain prominent northern Governors. The Governor of New York, W. L. Marcy, advised the passage of such a law, and his legislature pledged itself to pass it. Governor Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, recommended the passage of a similar law. Fortunately for the legislators elect, before they had had time to cover themselves with such degradation, there came a voice from the people which barred state action on that subject throughout the North for all time to come.

In due time the effort to obtain Congressional action was also made. President Jackson recommended the passage of a law that would "prohibit, under severe penalties, the circulation in the southern states, through the mails, of incendiary publications intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection." Such a law would naturally exclude every unfavorable mention of the institution. The Senate passed the law. But before the session was over the majority of the Representatives took wholesome note of the rising tide of indignation against this proposed establishment of a despotism over the mails. They saw that their support of any such dastardly attempt to muzzle free speech and free press would cover them with deserved infamy. The law was defeated. A Congressional effort to suppress the right of petition suffered the same fate.

Thus, for the first time, did the program of the coalition fail of accomplishment, and at a most important point. True the South had been silenced. Slavery was supreme over both white and black. But freedom of speech and press had been saved at the North,

never again to be assailed, and destined in due time to bear fruit in the ransom of the American nation from the horrors of human bondage. Says William Birney: "The tidal wave of the slave power had broken into foam on the solid rock of public opinion and receded, never again to rise so high until the rebellion."

If "The Reign of Andrew Jackson," as this remarkable administration has been facetiously, and not inaptly, termed, witnessed a formidable aggrandizement of the slave power, it may also be set down as the new starting point of that political force which, twenty years later, was able to marshal under its free labor banners an army of voters worthy of our American civilization. For reasons which will be given in due time the growth of the new party was slow. But it took no step backward. The American Anti-Slavery Society, and many affiliating societies propagated the new crusade. The northern pulpit began to preach the sinfulness of slavery. Voters appeared with the motto: "Vote for no man who votes against freedom." As early as 1840 anti-slavery men, feeling that that they had nothing to hope from either the Whig or Democratic organizations, supported their own candidate for President. They pursued the same course in 1844, in 1848, and in 1852. So far the new movement had gone forward without much concert of action, and was without official name. At one period it was the "Liberty" party, at others the "Free Democratic," the "National Republican," and the "Free Soil" party. Only in 1856 did all the shades and factions of the free labor movement agree to go together upon the common platform of opposition to slavery extension under the designation of "The National Republican party." The first candidate of the party was John C. Fremont, the second was Abraham Lincoln.

CHAPTER V.

What Slavery Actually Was.

Here and there may be found persons still living who were witnesses of, and participants in, the political movements referred to in some of the preceding papers of this series. It is nevertheless true that the great body of that generation has passed away. And inasmuch as most of my readers must be more or less

unfamiliar with the fundamental reasons for that hatred of slavery which animated the free-labor element and nurtured the growth of material for the coming Republican party, it is clearly a duty to devote a chapter here in the effort to illustrate what slavery actually was. While it would be possible to portray

the features of slavery at length, it happens that the materials are at hand which will enable the institution to outline its own hideous proportions in the clearest possible manner. This was the effective policy pursued by the old anti-slavery societies, and the illustrations which are presented were mainly derived from Mr. Pillsbury's "Acts of Anti Slavery and Pro-Slavery Apostles," and from Mrs. Stone's "Key."

While isolated churches of the North bore much strong testimony against slavery the attitude of the great religious bodies was generally hostile to the agitation of the subject. The backwardness of the northern ministry in assailing so palpable an evil was most hurtful to the free-labor cause. While individual preachers throughout that section preached the wickedness of slavery, the great ecclesiastical bodies officially deprecated all agitation of the subject and, in this, exhibited a weakness of moral conviction that repelled, and even drove out from the Church, a portion of its strongest and ablest supporters. This is all the more unaccountable in view of the fact that to the leaders and founders of these Churches are due some of the best early characterizations of slavery. Take, for example John Wesley, who pronounced slavery the "sum of all villainies." Wesley said:

"All man-buyers are exactly on a level with man-stealers. You know these slaves are procured by means nothing near so innocent as picking pockets, house-breaking, or robbery on the highway. They are procured by greater villainy than was ever practiced by Pagans; by murders, by the blood of the innocent poured on the ground like water. You are therefore, guilty of all these frauds, robberies and murders."

Reference has already been made to the fact that, in the early days of the Republic, a large body of Southern ministers urged the passage of gradual emancipation laws. But as early as 1830 the traces of this effort had begun to disappear, and the Churches assumed the phases of being the strongest bulwarks of slavery. For instance, in 1835, the Savannah Baptist Association, considering the status of slave husband and wife separated by sale, decided:

"Such separation is civilly a separation by death. And we believe that in the sight of God it would be so viewed."

In an address to the Governor of North Carolina in 1833, Rev. Dr. Furman expressed the sentiment of the Baptist Church on slavery by saying that "The right of holding

slaves is clearly established in the Holy Scriptures, both by precept and example." Not long after this deliverance Dr. Furman died. His administrator advertised his property thus:

"Notice!—On the first Monday in February next will be put up at public auction before the Court House the following property of the late Rev. Dr. Furman:

A plantation on Wateree Swamp,
A lot of land in Camden,
A library, chiefly theological,
27 negroes, some of them very prime.
2 mules, 1 horse, 1 old wagon."

Slaves seem to have been a favorite form of church endowment. Even Hamden Sydney College and Theological Seminary owned slaves enough to pay the pastor of the college church \$1,000 a year. Happily the slaves were spared listening to any of the sermons paid for by their labor. Also four other churches in the same vicinity owned slaves enough to pay their pastors so that communicants got this gospel free. Here is an advertisement from the Charleston Courier of Feb. 12, 1835:

"FIELD NEGROES!—By Thomas Gadsden on Tuesday the 17th inst., will be sold north of the Exchange, at 10 o'clock a. m., a prime gang of TEN NEGROES accustomed to cotton culture, belonging to the Independent Church of Christ's Church parish."

And another from the Savannah Republican of March 13, 1845:

"Also at the same time and place will be sold the following slaves: Charles, Peggy, Anttonett, Davy, September, Maria, Jenny and Isaac, levied on as the property of Henry T. Hall, to satisfy a mortgage in favor of the board of directors of the Theological Seminary of the synod of South Carolina and Georgia."

Slavery antedated the fundamental law and so needed no express authorization. It was, however, regulated by law. Here are several judicial decisions:

"The testator left his negro wench, Pen, to one daughter, and her future increase to another. The court decided the bequest to be good, and that all the children born of Pen, after the death of the testator, belonged to the sister of her mistress. The judge said: 'He who is absolute owner of a thing owns all its faculties for profits or increase, as well as the thing itself. This is every day's practice; and it is held that a man may grant the wool of a flock of sheep for years.'—Little's Kentucky Rep., 1823."

"With the consent of their masters, slaves may marry, and their moral power to agree to such a contract or connec-

tion as that of marriage cannot be doubted; but whilst in a state of slavery, it cannot produce any civil effect, because slaves are deprived of all civil rights."—Judge Matthews, of Louisiana; *Martin's Rep.*, VI., 550.

"A slave has never maintained an action against the violator of his bed. A slave is not admonished for incontinence, or punished for adultery; never prosecuted for bigamy, or petty treason, for killing a husband being a slave, any more than admitted to an appeal for murder."—Attorney General of Maryland, *Maryland Reports*, 561-563.

The following advertisements serve to show what could be done with the sanction of Southern laws:

"TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.

Ran away from the subscriber, a certain negro man named Ben (commonly known as Ben Fox.) Also another negro, by the name of Rigdon, who ran away on the 8th of this month.

I will give the reward of one hundred dollars for each of the above negroes. to be delivered to me or confined in the jail of Lenoir, or Jones county, or for the killing of them, so that I can see them.

November 12, 1836. W. D. COBB.

State of North Carolina, }
Lenoir County. }

Whereas, complaint has this day been made to us, two justices of the peace for said county, by William D. Cobb, of Jones county, that two negro slaves belonging to him, named Ben and Rigdon, have absented themselves from their master's service, etc., these are in the name of the state to command the said slaves forthwith to surrender themselves and return home to their said master. And we do hereby, by virtue of an act of the Assembly of this state, concerning slaves and servants, intimate and declare, if the said slaves do not surrender themselves and return home to their master after the publication of these presents, that any person may kill and destroy said slaves by such means as he or they think fit, without accusation or impeachment of any crime or offense for so doing, or without incurring any penalty or forfeiture thereby.

Given under our hands and seals, this 12th day of November, 1838.

B. COLEMAN, J. P., (Seal.)

JAMES JONES, J. P., (Seal.)

On April 28, 1836, in the city of St. Louis, a negro stabbed an officer who

arrested him. He was seized by the mob, tied to a tree and burned to death. The St. Louis correspondent of a New York paper described the affair. He said:

"The shrieks and groans of the victim were piercing, and to see one limb after another drop off into the fire was awful indeed. I visited the place this morning. The legs and arms were gone, only a part of the head and body remained."

The opinion rendered by the judge of the Circuit Court of Missouri was, that "As the burning was countenanced by a majority of the citizens it was a case which transcended the jurisdiction of the grand jury."

A young South Carolinian became tenderly attached to a mulatto girl. He aided her to escape from her master and married her. He was arrested, tried and found guilty. Sentence of death was pronounced upon him by Judge J. B. O'Neale, accompanied by lengthy remarks. Here is an extract from the same:

"John L. Brown—It is my duty to announce to you the consequences of your conviction at Winnsboro. You are to die. To die an ignominious death—the death on the gallows!" (Then follows a long homily on the infamy of the crime of helping slaves to run away.) Then this learned judge continues: "Reflect on your past life and prepare for death. 'Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth,' is the language of inspired wisdom. This comes home appropriately to you in this trying moment. You are young. If you had remembered your Creator in your past days you would now be in a felon's place. Still, it is not too late to remember your Creator. He calls early, and he calls late. He stretches out the arms of a father's love to you—to the vilest sinner—and says: 'Come unto Me and be saved.' The Scriptures will aid you to understand; and understanding, to call upon the only one who can help you and save you—Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world. To Him I commend you, etc., etc., etc. The sentence of the law is," (the sentence for hanging in the usual form.)

The printed sentence of Brown got into the Northern, and even into English papers, and opened not a few eyes to the nature of slavery. It also became

the theme of one of Whittier's most stirring poems. I make room for a few stanzas:

ON THE SENTENCE OF JOHN L. BROWN.

Hail thou who seest late and long
A license from the Holy Book
For brutal lust and belshish wrong.
Men of the pulpit, look!
Lift up those cold and atheist eyes,
This vice of thy teaching see;
And tell us how to heaven will rise
The incense of this sacrilege—
This blossom of the gallows tree!

Search out for slavery's hour of need
Some fitting text of sacred writ;
Give heaven the credit of a deed
Which shames the sinner's pit.
Kneel, smooth blasphemer, unto him
Whose truth is on thy lips a lie—
Ask that his bright winged cherubim
May bend a cloud that shield grim
To guard and bless and sanctify.

Send out the summons east and west,
And south and north, let all be there
Where he who pined the oppressed
Swings out in sun and air.
Let not a Democratic hand
The grizzly nanna's task refuse;
There let each loyal patriot stand,
Awaiting slavery's command,
To twist the rope and draw the noose.

Still let a mousing priesthood ply
Their gabled text and gloss of sin,
And make the lettered scroll deny
Its living soul within.
Still let the place-fed riddled knave
Plead robbery's right with purchased lips,
And tell us that our fathers gave
For Freedom's pedestal, a slave,
The frieze and moulding, chains and whips!

But ye who own that higher law
Whose tablets in the heart are set,
Speak out in words of power and awe
That God is living yet!
Etc., etc., etc.

It must seem to many readers almost incredible that less than a generation has passed since the traffic in human beings was going on in this country as shown by this copy of a slave invoice:

INVOICE.

"HALIFAX, N. C., Nov. 16, 1839.

"Dear Sir:—I have shipped in the brig Addison—prices as below:

No 1 Caroline Ennis.....	\$650 00
No 2 Silvy Holland.....	625 00
No 3 Silvy Booth.....	487 50
No 4 Maria Pollock.....	475 00
No 5 Emeline Pollock.....	475 00
No 6 Delia Aberitt.....	475 00

"The two girls that cost \$650 and \$625 were bought before I shipped my first. I have a great many negroes offered to me but I will not pay the prices they ask, for I know they will come down. I have no opposition in the market. I will wait until I hear from you before I buy, and then I can judge what I must pay. Goodwin will send you the bill of lading for my negroes, as he has shipped

them with his own. Write often, as the times are critical, and it depends on the prices you get to govern me in buying.

"Yours, etc.,

"G. W. BARNES.

"Theophilus Freeman, New Orleans."

Here is a copy of a dodger thrown about in the streets of New Orleans, showing an everyday occurrence:

RAFFLE!—Mr. Joseph Jennings respectfully informs his friends and the public that, at the request of many acquaintances, he has been induced to purchase from Mr. Osborn, of Missouri, the celebrated dark bay horse "Star," aged five years, square trotter and warranted sound; with a new light trotting buggy and harness; also the dark, stout mulatto girl, "Sarah," aged about thirty years, general house servant, valued at nine hundred dollars and guaranteed. These will be raffled for at 4 o'clock p. m. Feb 1st, at the selection hotel of the subscribers. Fifteen hundred chances at one dollar each. No chances recognized unless paid for previous to the commencement.

JOSEPH JENNINGS."

A few more examples indicative of the atrocities of slavery will have to suffice.

[From the Appalachicola Gazette, May 19, 1838.]

"ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS REWARD—Ran away from my plantation on the 6th inst., three negro men, all of dark complexion.

"Bill is about five feet four inches high, aged about twenty-six, a scar on his upper lip, also one on his shoulder, and has been badly cut on his arm, speaks quick and a venomous look.

"Daniel is about the same height, chunky and well set, broad, flat mouth, with a pleasing countenance, rather inclined to show his teeth when talking; no particular marks recollected; aged about twenty-three.

"Noah is about six feet three or four inches high, twenty-eight years old, with rather a down impudent look, insolent in his discourse, with a large mark on his breast, a good many large scars, caused by a whip, on his back; has been shot in the back of his arm with small shot. The above reward will be paid to any one who will kill the three, or fifty for either one, or twenty dollars apiece for them delivered to me at my plantation, alive, on Chattahoochie, Early county.

J. McDONALD."

[Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, May 9.]

"REWARD—About the first of March last, the negro man Ransom left me, without the least provocation whatever, I will give a reward of \$20 for said negro

if taken, dead or alive, and if killed in any attempt, an advance of \$5 will be paid

BRYANT JOHNSON,
Crawford Co., Ga."

"**RAN AWAY**—A negro woman and two children. A few days before she went off I burnt her with a hot iron on the left side of her face I tried to make the letter M.

MICAJAH RICKS, Nash Co., N.C."

Sumter County. (Ala.) Whig, Nov. 6, 1845.

NEGRO DOGS—The undersigned having bought the entire pack of negro dogs of the Hay & Allen stock, he now proposes to catch runaway negroes. His charge will be three dollars a day for hunting, and fifteen dollars for catching a runaway. He resides one and a half miles north of Livingston, near the lower Jones bluff road.

Nov. 6. 1842. WM. GAMBEL.

Charleston (S. C.) Courier

TWENTY DOLLARS REWARD—Ran away from the subscriber, on the 14th inst., a negro girl named Molly. She is 16 or 17 years of age, slim made, lately branded on her left cheek, thus "R," and a piece is taken off her ear on the same side; the same letter is branded on the inside of both her legs.

ABNER ROSS,
Fairfield District, S. C.

Wilmington (N. C.) Advertiser, July 13, 1839.

RAN AWAY—MY NEGRO MAN RICHARD. A reward of twenty-five dollars will be paid for his apprehension, dead or alive. Satisfactory proof will only be required of his being killed. He has with him, in all probability, his wife Eliza, who ran away from Col. Thompson, now a resident of Alabama.

D. H. RHODES.

When "Uncle Tom's Cabin" first appeared, Mrs. Stowe was accused of exaggeration in the pictures of slave life found in her book. She then published "The Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin," being a collation of authoritative testimony which rather more than confirmed the worst impressions deducible from the story. With those who have read the "Key" the examples above cited can no more than confirm opinions already entertained in regard to the cruelty of American slavery.

The deplorable lot of the slave, especially in the states bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, cannot be imagined, much less described. Mrs. Stowe's Legree is an amiable wretch in comparison with some of the real Legrees who are brought upon the witness stand in her "Key." In the cotton and sugar sea-

sons the sufferings of the slaves were past all language. They were housed in miserable huts. An eye witness, who had spent years in the South, said that "he did not remember ever to have seen a negro hut with a floor, or with more than one room." The regulation allowance of food was one peck of corn in the ear for one week's food. Childbirth regularly occurred in the fields while at work. Plantation gangs, made up of male and female, uniformly decreased in number. The average experience of planters in this respect is thus given by one of their number: "I used to, when I first begun, have considerable trouble fussin' with 'em, and tryin' to make 'em hold out, docterin' on 'em up when they's sick, givin' 'em old clothes an' all that; but law, 'twant no sort o' use. I lost on 'em, and 'twas heaps o' trouble. Now, you see, I just put 'em straight through, sick or well. When one nigger's dead, I buy another; and I find it comes cheaper and easier every way."

When Abraham Lincoln was a young man of twenty-two he became half owner of a flat boat and its contents. With this he floated down the Sangamon, and the Illinois, and the Mississippi to New Orleans. He and his partner had disposed of their cargo, and were sauntering about the city when an unusual sight presented itself. They overtook a lot of slaves that were chained together. They followed these into a stable yard which they reached just in time to hear the auctioneer's "going," "going," "gone!" and to see a mulatto mother, with her child in her arms, torn from her child and handed over to a brutalized master.

The agonizing screams of that mother as she was separated from her child and lashed into the street pierced young Lincoln to the inmost depths. He felt that he must do something then and there. And then he felt that he could hardly wait until his arrival at his home in the North in order that he might do something there. When he at length did arrive at his home he, for the first time, fully realized the magnitude of his wish. For the slave owner, cruel and brutal beyond the power of words as he was, ruled in the North as well as in the South, and all the power and resources of a Nation thirty millions strong stood between young Lincoln and the unfeeling owner of that slave mother. But who can say that that mother's shrieks of anguish had ceased their echoes in the heart of Abraham Lincoln until that memorable day in September 1862, when they burst forth to the joy of the whole world in his immortal proclamation of emancipation!

CHAPTER VI.

The Mexican War and the Fugitive Slave Law.

With the facts set forth in the preceding chapter, fresh in mind, the reader need not be told that, from 1836 to 1860, slavery was supreme south of Mason's and Dixon's line. He will also be convinced that, as one result of this supremacy, every humanitarian tendency of the system in the religious, social and civil organization of the South had been almost entirely extinguished. Before concluding this part of my subject, which has for its purpose the depicting of the growth and the aggressions of the slave power, further note must also be taken of the steps by which the Democracy possessed itself of successive administrations; of congresses and courts which made and repealed laws at its behest, and of how the country was ruled by executives over whose heads was ever brandished the lash of the slave driver's whip. To keep the outlines of this great struggle in mind, it will aid the reader's comprehension to remember the following events, as the result of early anti-slavery effort:

First—The emancipation of slaves in the Northern States from 1777 to 1823

Second—The ordinance of 1789 forbidding slavery northwest of the Ohio River.

Third—The suppression of the African slave trade in 1808.

Fourth—The Missouri compromise in 1820, prohibiting slavery, except in Missouri, north of the north line of Arkansas.

Fifth—The failure of Congress, under Jackson, to banish free labor newspapers from the mails.

The defeat of this Calhoun press-gag law was already a defensive effort against the advancing power of slavery, and it was significant as being the last success attained by the free labor element in National affairs prior to the war.

The successful aggressions of the slave power completely cover the period from 1830 to 1860. The landmarks of this gigantic and baneful progress may be set up as follows:

First—The formation of the new Democratic slave party by the Jackson-Calhoun-Crawford coalition in 1830.

Second—The insurrection in Texas, led by slaveholders, in 1836.

Third—The annexation of Texas, and the Mexican war in 1845.

Fourth—The passage of the Fugitive Slave law in 1850.

Fifth—The repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska acts of 1854.

Sixth—The Dred Scott decision nationalizing slavery in 1857.

Seventh—The war of the Rebellion in 1861.

As has already been intimated, the new slave-holding Democracy organized by the Jackson-Calhoun coalition was a more formidable political instrumentality than had ever been seen on this continent. Opposition to its leaders was naturally to be expected. This opposition pitched its tents in the Whig camp. Although there had been a Whig party in the early days of the Republic it had substantially disappeared. For a number of years, before and after 1820, there is no record of organized Whig existence. But the new Democracy had utterly ignored the claims of Clay, Webster and other eminent citizens. With such names as leaders, the growth of a strong opposition party was inevitable. As a matter of fact the Whig party was able, on two occasions, in 1840 and 1848, to place their candidates in power. But whether the administration was Democratic or Whig, there was one power which remained entirely constant—the reins, during these years, never fell from the hands of the Slaveholder.

During the Senate controversy in regard to the exclusion of northern newspapers from the mails the bill was ordered to a third reading by a tie vote of Senators. It then passed the Senate by the help of the affirmative vote of Van Buren, the president of the Senate. Mr. Van Buren's home was New York, the most important of the states. He was nominated as the successor to Jackson, and elected president in 1836.

In consequence of President Jackson's memorable quarrel with the United States Bank, and of his injudicious financial management, and of tariff reductions and consequent heavy importations, a monetary stringency of the severest character was precipitated during Van Buren's term. He was also opposed to the annexation of Texas. These two features, coupled with General Har-

rison's military prestige resulted in Van Buren's defeat in 1840.

General Harrison had no record which was objectionable to the slavery interests. On the contrary he was known to be a strong hater of the anti-slavery movement. He was at one time regarded as favoring the re-establishment of slavery in Indiana. The other incidents which popularized the hero of Tippecanoe at the north are fresh in the reader's mind, having entered largely into campaign literature two years ago, when his grandson was elected to the Presidency. In the campaign of 1840 the Liberty party of the north supported James G. Birney, for President.

The Whig nominee in 1844 was one of the first orators, and one of the most popular men of his day, Henry Clay, of Kentucky. This campaign and the previous, Harrison, campaign were the most noted Presidential contests in our National history. Henry Clay had favored gradual emancipation in Kentucky about 1800. He had also given the Texas annexation scheme only a grudging support. These things lost him the body of the slaveholding vote. His popularity was greatest at the North; but even there these three considerations operated against him: first, he had voted for the admission of Missouri as a slaveholding state; second, while his conscience was known to be against the annexation of Texas, his public acts were on the side of the South; third, the preceding Whig administration of Tyler, who had occupied the Presidential chair after the death of Harrison, was a stench in the nostrils of Whigs generally. Polk, a man of no reputation, but known to favor the desires of the South in regard to Texas, was elected.

In this campaign New York State again cast the deciding vote. The Liberty, or Free Soil party of the north, in which lay the real germ of the future Republican party, again supported James G. Birney for President. Had Mr. Birney's strength been added to Clay's vote in New York State he would have been elected. This fact operated as a temporary check upon the growth of the new party. The personal enthusiasm for Clay was intense. To have the cup of victory dashed from their very lips by this handful of abolitionists was almost intolerable. This incident, more than any other cause, prevented an immediate change of front by the Whigs, many of whom were ripe for free labor principles.

And if the date of the complete organization of the new and coming party was thus postponed, it can hardly be regard-

ed as having been an unmitigated misfortune. The new party must have a new, distinctive set of principles. It should not be beholden to either of the old parties, but should draw its recruits from both alike. A great many Democrats actually found themselves in the free labor camp shortly after the Clay campaign, in this wise: Texas annexation was known to be an outrage upon the rights of a neighbor republic, nothing more nor less. Democrats of the north understood the scheme perfectly; they knew that more slave territory was wanted, and that they were being dragged into a false position by their southern leaders. In this crisis Mr. Pardee, then a citizen of Wooster, O., wrote to the Representative of his district in Congress, Mr. Brinkerhoff, of Mansfield, suggesting that, as part of the law admitting the new territory, there be a provision forbidding slavery in the territory so admitted. Mr. Brinkerhoff being a free soiler, induced David Wilmot, a Democratic member from Pennsylvania, to propose the amendment. This was the famous "Wilmot Proviso." The moment was opportune, and by this accident the name of Wilmot, otherwise without significance, became fixed into the political history of the country. The measure was defeated, but large numbers of Democrats to whom the exactions of the slave drivers was becoming irksome, had rallied to its support, and thereafter sought refuge in the ranks of the free soilers.

Mexico had abolished slavery in 1829, but Texas was far removed from the capital, and was very accessible to the South. A lot of slaveholders settled there in defiance of Mexican law. They got up a pretended insurrection. It was a slaveholders' farce and deceived nobody. Immediately after the election of Polk these tricks and subterfuges were no longer necessary. Texas was annexed and war with Mexico declared. Easy terms might have been made with Mexico for the acquisition of Texas, but that was not what the Democrats in power desired. They determined to annex all northern Mexico as a recruiting field for more slave states, and so this most barbarous war was forced upon an unwilling people.

When peace was made, in 1848, the United States had gained in territory to the extent of nearly four hundred thousand square miles by the addition of the area now composing California, Utah, Arizona and New Mexico. These were the spoils of war. Texas was already slave territory. The territories of Utah and New Mexico established slavery in

1860. The scheme was on the eve of fulfillment when the fortunes of politics and war wrought the collapse of this monument of infamy.

Before the Mexican war had terminated the patriotic impulses of the people had been stirred, and General Taylor, the hero of many victories, returned home loaded with honors and glory. He was a Whig, a most fortunate circumstance for the Whig party, which was just then casting about for some available candidate for President. General Taylor pleased the south; at the north he dazzled by the glitter of military prestige. No other nomination was possible, but defeat at the election was most probable and would have been assured but for a most unlooked for incident.

Voters of this day are fully aware of the potential influence of the state of New York in our Presidential elections. With the south solid for Democracy and the north well nigh unanimous on the Republican side, the large electoral vote of New York state decides the contest and makes the President. While the state vote is tolerably constant and largely Republican, the heavy vote of New York City is a factor that cannot be depended upon. It is liable to great changes. Under these circumstances the vote of New York City may tip the balance and fix the ruling policy for the greatest nation in existence. The vote of New York defeated Blaine and elected Cleveland. Benjamin Harrison's election is due to the favor of New York.

My readers will have noticed that New York state also enjoyed this power of making and unmaking presidents before the war. Van Buren owed his success in 1836 to his residence in that state. Defections from the Whig party gave that state, and the presidency, to Polk in 1844. The incident to which reference was made above gave that state to General Taylor in 1848 and resulted in his election.

Between General Cass, the Democratic nominee, and Martin Van Buren, there was a serious feud. The Free Soil party had now obtained such proportions as to render it formidable as a balancing weight on either side. Mr. Van Buren seized this opportunity, obtained the Free Soil nomination, and with the following thus obtained, added to his personal popularity, was able to subtract from Cass New York state and a number of votes sufficient to insure the election of General Taylor.

The impression left by an impartial study of the events of this period is that

the Whig party was doomed, even prior to Taylor's election. The all powerful slave interest preferred the party its own hands had made to this cringing interloper from the North. But impulses of gratitude to General Taylor for his Mexican campaign gave him five Southern states. He died after occupying the presidential chair only two months, and was succeeded by Vice President Millard Fillmore, who gave to Whiggery its final stab. It then died and was buried, and none too soon. There were those, however, who did not take this view of the subject and so, under the guise of General Scott's alleged candidacy, in 1852, the Whig remains were once more hawked around over the country. Scott got the votes of four states and Pierce the votes of twenty seven states. Since that time the grave has been undisturbed.

Pro-slavery control of the executive and legislative departments of the government, as well as of the Supreme Court, being now (1850) complete, no obstacle existed to the enslavement of the entire country, so far as that might be accomplished by federal intervention. Although President Fillmore was a resident of Buffalo, New York, no more pliant tool could have been selected in South Carolina or Mississippi. His chief claim to historic eminence was his act in affixing his approving signature to the infamous Fugitive Slave Law.

Clauses in the Ordinance of 1787, also in the Missouri Compromise Act, provided for the recapture of fugitive slaves, but the enforcement of these provisions was left to the authorities of the states. Many slaves had been thus restored to their masters; but the class of slave owners complained, and probably with truth, that many of their chattels were allowed to escape. They demanded and passed the Fugitive Slave Law. This law prescribed:

First—Jurisdiction in all cases under this law was taken from state, and given to federal officers. Of course the latter were the appointees of the president.

Second—Any citizen could be summoned to join the "posse comitatus" in recapturing a fugitive. Refusal was punishable by severe penalties.

Third—No trial by jury was allowed. No appeal was allowed to state magistrates.

Fourth—Rescues, and every deviation from the spirit of the act, rendered the party liable to criminal prosecution.

The Fugitive Slave act constituted part of what are known as the "Compromise Measures of 1850," but it is difficult to detect any trace of yielding on

the part of the South. True, California was admitted without slavery, but the constitution that had been adopted by that state left no choice in the matter. All the rest of the Mexican robbery was held in reserve for slavery.

In 1852 both Clay and Webster sought the nomination of the moribund Whig party for the presidency. But there still remained one available military chieftain, General Scott, who no doubt hoped that his Mexican victories would place him in the direct line of succession to Generals Jackson, Harrison and Taylor. Brains and statesmanship counted for nothing, expediency and slave subserviency only were considered, and Scott was nominated. Franklin Pierce, a New Hampshire Democrat, whose name had been unknown to the nation, was elected. Both Clay and Webster died within a year after the election. At this election the Free Soil party cast its vote for John P. Hale.

Pierce lost no time in convincing the Democratic party that no mistake had been made in selecting him as its leader. The opportunity was soon to come. Great events were in store for his term of power. The passage of the Fugitive act under Fillmore, and the overwhelming victory of Pierce, emboldened the slave power to attempt aggressions of so sweeping and radical a character as to startle the country. The advancing column of the free states toward the west must be counter-checked or slavery would fall behind in the race. Laws were introduced into Congress for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise Act, and providing for the admission of the States of Kansas and Nebraska on the "Squatter Sovereignty" principle. The latter empowered these states to adopt constitutions with or without slavery.

This repeal following closely after the passage of the Fugitive Slave law, which had borne fruit in much slave hunting through the North, threw that section into great agitation. On the 2nd of June, 1854, the repudiation of the Missouri compact having recently been consummated in the passage and Presidential approval of the Kansas Nebraska bill, Anthony Burns having been adjudged a fugitive at Boston, President Pierce ordered the United States Cutter "Morris" to take him from that city to lifelong bondage in Virginia. The following memorable stanzas appeared in the N. Y. Tribune of June 12:

"Hail to the Stars and Stripes!
The boastful flag all hail!
The tyrant trembles now,
And at the sight grows pale;
The Old World groans in pain,
And turns her eye to see,
Beyond the western main,
The emblem of the free.

"All hail the flaunting lie!
The Stars grow pale and dim—
The Stripes are bloody scars,
A lie the flaunting hyum!
It shields the pirate's deck,
It binds a man in chains;
It yokes the captive's neck,
And wipes the bloody stains.

"Hail to the Stars and Stripes!
Hope beams in every ray!
And, shining through the bars
Of gloom, points out the way:
The Old World sees the light,
That shall her cells illumine;
And, shrinking back to nighr,
Oppression reads her doom.

"Tear down the flaunting lie!
Half-mast the Starry Flag!
Insult no sunny sky
With hate's polluted rag!
Destroy it, ye who can!
Deep sink it in the waves!
It bears a fellow-man
To groan with fellow-slaves."

The abrogation of the Missouri compact roused the North from its sleep. Its torpor had been only disturbed by the Mexican war; now wakefulness was fully established. The ultimate design of the lawless despotism in power stood clearly revealed. All barriers were to be thrown down and slavery was to be, not sectional, but national. Freedom had been sectional, but it was thereafter to have no place in the Republic consecrated to liberty by the fathers of the Nation. The consciences of Northern voters who had not yet been chained to the dominant party were quickened. The word "abolition" lost its terror. Free Soil men and Liberty men, Wilmot Proviso Democrats and disgusted Whigs went together with one accord, under the banner of the new
They nominated John C. Fremont and gave him 114 electoral votes. The defunct Whigs nominated Fillmore, who received eight votes. Buchanan, the Democratic nominee, received 174 votes and was elected.

In thus attempting to summarize in a single chapter the leading events, between Jackson and Buchanan, which led to the formation of the Republican party, I am conscious of having undertaken too much. All the volumes in a good-sized library would not more than suffice to contain the history of this period. I do, however, cherish the hope that, as an aid in comprehending and memorizing the political sequences of this epoch in American history, the above epitome may be of substantial assistance. Certain of the very greatest factors in effecting those changes of opinion, which resulted in placing the Republican party in power, have not yet been so much as touched upon.

CHAPTER VII.

Buchanan's Administration.

Readers of the preceding articles of this series, especially the younger class of voters, may be inclined to say: "What has all this to do with your being a Republican? My reply is: Very much, and in many ways. Political duty must have a rational, or a moral basis, and, so far, nothing has been stated that is irrelevant to the justification of Republican policy. To the superficial student great political reforms may sometimes seem to have been the result of a sudden impulse. Such is not the case.

Oliver Cromwell was begotten by centuries of royal oppression. Hundreds of sorrowful years brooded upon France before the dawn of 1789. For more than a century the colonists had endured those exactions of the lordling satraps of the British kings which came to a sudden stop July 4, 1776. The protest against generations of cruelty to slaves, and against the intolerable selfishness of the slave masters, with its roots in the "Liberty," the "Free Labor," and the "Free Soil" parties of previous years, matured at length into the Republican tree of 1856.

It is nevertheless possible, by anticipating a little, to present at once certain direct and tangible reasons for my adhesion to the Republican party from the beginning until now. My last chapter, but one, contained a meager epitome of the political changes of thirty years, ending with the election of James Buchanan. In the face of the best efforts that could be put forth in behalf of the nominees of the fully fledged Republican party, Buchanan received a large majority of the electoral votes, and the slave power contemplated the situation with fresh assurance. One step only need be taken to render its dominance complete and co-extensive with the territorial limits of the United States. This step was taken in 1857, in the following manner:

Dred Scott, a Missouri slave who was taken to a free territory, seized the occasion to sue for his freedom. Having been sold to a citizen of another state,

he was then compelled to transfer his suit to the federal courts; thence the case went to the Supreme Court on appeal. The decision, delivered by Judge Taney, was, in substance:

1st. That Scott's relation as the property of another man was not effected by his residence in a free state.

2d. That no slave, or descendant of a slave, could be a citizen, or sue in the federal courts; that, in fact, he had no rights that a white man was bound to respect."

3d. That it was the duty of Congress to protect, and not prohibit, slavery in the territories.

The delivery of the Dred Scott decision was the last slaveholding aggression of national import prior to the war. Indeed no farther augmentation to its power was possible by federal sanction unless it was in the form of a law repealing the ordinance of 1787 prohibiting slavery northwest of the Ohio River. With the Dred Scott case broadly interpreted even that would have been only a matter of form. But before any such measure was proposed the attention of the Democratic oligarchy was imperatively riveted to the contemplation of phenomena of an entirely different character. The crusade of the compromise-breakers was bearing its legitimate fruit. The elections in the Northern States indicated that, at the next presidential contest, the scepter of power would pass into Republican hands. Democrats by the thousand were flocking into the camp of the new party.

In the hope of averting such a catastrophe, and of quelling the indignation aroused by the Dred Scott mischief, Senator Douglas and his followers made frantic efforts to commit the Democratic party to the "Squatter Sovereignty" idea. But the Douglas faction, while it might be omnipotent in Illinois, was really an element of secondary consequence in the national Democratic organization. The latter was in full control of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial departments of the government. Its leaders knew that, on the 4th of March, 1861, the reins of power would have to be delivered into the hands of the Republican nominee for the presidency.

I now call the reader's attention to the several steps that were deemed necessary during, and with the consent of

the Democratic administration of Buchanan, prior to, and in anticipation of the transfer of power to the legally and peaceably elected officers of the Government:

December 27, 1860—Castle Pinckney and Fort Moultrie, at Charleston, S. C., delivered to South Carolina State troops.

January 3, 1861—Fort Pulaski given to Savannah troops.

January 3—The United States arsenal at Mt. Vernon, Ala., with 20,000 stand of arms, handed over to Alabama troops.

January 4—Fort Morgan, Mobile, given to Alabama State troops.

January 9—The "Star of the West," with provisions for Sumter, driven off by South Carolina guns.

January 10—Forts Jackson and St. Phillips, below New Orleans, given to custody of Louisiana State troops.

January 14—Pensacola Navy Yard handed over to Florida State troops.

January 14—Baton Rouge arsenal given to hands of Louisiana State troops.

January 31—New Orleans Mint and Custom House given to State authorities.

February 2—Little Rock arsenal delivered over to Arkansas troops.

February 8—Rebel flag raised and Rebel constitution adopted at Montgomery, Ala.

February 9—Jefferson Davis and A. H. Stevens elected President and Vice President by the insurrectionists.

February 16—General Twiggs surrenders all federal property in Texas to the state authorities.

March 2—War vessels Dodge, Aiken, and Cass handed over to state officers of South Carolina and Louisiana.

All these acts were committed previous to the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, and while his leading supporters were striving in a peace congress at Washington to avert war by yielding up many of their well established rights. All the best arms had been taken from the North and stored in Southern arsenals. Every serviceable ship was in Southern waters or in distant seas. The rebels held every fort, except Sumter, from Fortress Monroe to the Rio Grande. They held, by the consent and with the connivance of the Democratic administration, two thirds of our sea coast, and the Mississippi from Cairo to its mouth. Such is the record, and such was the conduct of the Democratic party after an almost uninterrupted control of the government for thirty-two years.

In 1884, at the end of twenty-four years of power, James G. Blaine was the candidate of the Republican party for president. On the eve of the elec-

tion an accident occurred in New York City which lost him a few hundred votes, but these were sufficient to turn the scale and elect the Democratic nominee. The power of the Republic was delivered into the control of Mr. Cleveland, and the new president of the people's choice had at his back the new nation, now re-deemed from slavery, and grown from thirty millions to sixty millions strong, to aid him in the enforcement of the constitution and the laws.

Jefferson said that in a Republic the nation bows to the will of the majority, and that is why I am a Republican. Jefferson the father of the Democratic party! Bob Ingersoll the father of Christianity!

The unwillingness of the Democratic party to yield the power to Republicans in 1860 was claimed to be due to the alleged designs of the "abolition" party. The organs of slavery always used the term "abolition" in referring to the Republican party, and for many years with appreciable effect, for the caste prejudice against the African race was almost as prevalent in the north as in the south. In the south the old Calhoun states rights doctrine was broadly assumed as ample justification for the formation of a separate confederacy. The northern wing of the party being necessarily left out in this view of the case, the idea of saddling the causes of the war on the Republicans was gratefully acceptable. Its press sought a refuge for its infamy by spurting these baseless excuses for the black treachery of its party leaders, as the cuttle-fish hides in the folds of the inky fluid it has voided. As the reader is well aware, no record is plainer than that of the Republican party up to, and even including Mr. Lincoln's inaugural address. The party would prevent the extension of slavery into new territory, but would also give any guarantee that could be required not to interfere with slavery where it existed. The perfect fallacy of the claim of northern Democrats that Republicans caused the war was most eloquently demonstrated in a speech made by A. H. Stephens, afterwards Vice President of the Confederacy, to the Georgia convention, January 31, 1861. Here is an extract:

"Pause, I entreat you, and consider for a moment what reasons you can give that will even satisfy yourselves in calmer moments, what reasons you can give to your fellow-sufferers in the calamity you will bring upon us. What reasons can you give to the nations of the earth to justify it? They will be the calm and deliberate judges in the

case; and to what cause, or what one overt act can you name or point on which to rest the plea of justification? What right has the north assailed? What interest of the south has been invaded? What justice has been denied? What claim, founded in justice and right, has been withheld? Can either of you to-day name one government act of wrong deliberately and purposely done by the government at Washington of which the south has a right to complain? I challenge the answer!"

The actual reasons which induced the Democratic leaders to plunge the Nation into war had not, therefore, any relation to fears for the institution of slavery in the slave states. It is also true that these reasons were closely bound to those causes which, on the other hand, fostered the growth of Republican conviction. A brief analysis of these impelling causes will necessitate some attention to the period that has already been cursorily glanced over.

Had the Whig party, upon its re-organization, in 1825 to 1840, adopted the principles of slavery restriction the Republican party would never have been born. Here we have presented to us another of those crises in our political history which provokes a multitude of interesting, if profitless, speculative queries. The old party, of highly respectable antecedents, with the advantage, in its ante-Jackson record, of a leadership of the loftiest patriotism, of the ablest scholarship and pronounced morality, had now reached its fateful forks in the road. One finger-board pointed to slavery restriction and to certain present defeat—the other finger-board pointed directly South toward the camp of slavery and to possible success. The party took the route last named and actually did elect Harrison in 1840. Had the Whig leaders taken the other road they might possibly have elected Clay in 1844, when he was defeated by the votes of the Liberty party in New York. The probabilities, however, are against such a result. But it is certain that those dissatisfied elements which afterwards took shape in the Liberty, in the Free Labor and Free Soil parties would have helped to swell its power. All those impulses which became tributary streams for the nourishment of the Republican party would naturally have been absorbed by it, and thus the overflow of slavery into free territory might have been prevented without the armed struggle of the rebellion. In that case we should still have slavery, and there would be no New South, but a restless and tumultuous North would be inevitable.

Without wasting further time on these conjectures, suffice it to say that, from the time I have referred to to its death, the Whig party vied with the Calhoun Democracy in looking after a close political connection with the South. The North was divided. The South, with its one great interest to uphold, was solid and invincible. It remains to glance at some of the causes of the overshadowing power of slavery during the next twenty years.

One of these causes was to be found in the great political sagacity of the acknowledged custodians of the slave interest. As we have already seen, the founders of this faction were Calhoun, Jackson and their associates. Their favorite instrumentality was the Democratic party. Their successors included in their ranks such men as Mason of Virginia, Clingman, of North Carolina, Aiken and Brooks, of South Carolina, Toombs and Stephens, of Georgia, Yulee, of Florida, Foote, of Mississippi, Benjamin and Slidell, of Louisiana, and Breckenridge, of Kentucky. These "Fire Eaters" and their followers controlled federal legislation. They rarely sought high executive office for themselves, being content rather with the possession and control of the executive department. For this reason we have the mortification of seeing the highest places of the government occupied during this period by men of marked intellectual and moral inferiority.

What a dreary list of names is that between Jackson and Lincoln! Two only, of these names, deserve to live, Harrison and Taylor, and these only by reason of their military services. All the others actually had greatness thrust upon them on the score of availability and subserviency. In the south such men as Clay and Benton gave way to the Polks and the Tylers. When northern men were desired they took, not a Dix or a Douglas, but a Pierce, or a Buchanan; not a Webster, but a Fillmore. The holder of every great office, home and foreign, had been duly inspected and branded by the cotton lords.

From time immemorial weak human nature has gone down before the blandishments of wealth and fashion. In the days of its glory the gilded chariots of slavery dazzled the social world. That which Ward McAllister's "400" is to New York city today, such was the class of three hundred thousand slaveholders to American society. Their power was scarcely less marked in the commercial centers of the North than in the South. The cotton and tobacco produced by the labor of their slaves con-

stituted the chief elements of our export commerce, and brought back to them an unceasing stream of gold. They and their families, waited on by retinues of servants, went back and forth between Europe and America, and up and down in the world, the envy of man and womankind. They hobnobbed with prince and baron, and longed for the regime of American lord and lordling, for which the illusive title of "Confederacy" was to be the entering wedge. They utterly and openly despised labor and all laborers. The very atmosphere which surrounded the slave lords was heavy with temptation. But few could become their associates without partaking, more or less, of a desire to be similarly situated. They gave their sons and daughters the best educational and social opportunities the schools of the world afforded. Add to their advantages of wealth, of independent ease, of mental training and polish of manners, the fact that they possessed

the government, that all power and preferment must proceed from them, and it is no longer cause of wonder that the poisoned mildew distilled from such influences at length penetrated into, and paralyzed, some of the noblest impulses of the young Republic.

Among the saddest pages of our national history are those which chronicle the fall of great statesmen before this Moloch of slavery. Individual effort, spasms of reform, segregated political factions, all were barren against such a wall of power. Only a great political party, built upon a broad platform, with aims that were direct, simple and possible, could cope with such an adversary. Years passed away, and the tribulations of the friends of humanity and the haters of oppression were many and sore, but in his own good time God brought all these together upon one common platform, animated by one common purpose—that of putting an end to the encroachments of the slave power.

CHAPTER VIII.

Come-Outerism.

The reader has probably borne it in mind that the first agitation of the slavery question in this country was general. Its point of greatest intensity, as a matter of fact, was in the border slave states. The first political struggle was terminated by the Missouri Compromise of 1820. This settlement of the political status of slavery seems to have been followed by a quiet sleep of ten years on the part of the Northern states. They saw how the fetters were falling away from the slave in twelve states at that very moment, in compliance with the gradual emancipation laws, and they reasoned that exasperating agitation could only retard the progress of the reform which they felt, in time, must spread over all the states of the Union. The examples and teachings of Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson were fresh in mind, and the grand blessings of liberty and equality, now assured by the new Republic, were the theme of exultation on every hand.

Other influences contributed to allay apprehension as to the future of human bondage. Napoleon had abolished slavery in Spain—unfortunately his naval

impotence prevented his making his decree effective in Cuba. Buenos Ayres abolished servitude in 1813. The Catholic Mexican Republic freed all slaves in Mexico and Texas. Great Britain completed the good work for all her dominions, paying upwards of one hundred millions as indemnities to masters. This left only the monarchy of Brazil and the republic of America in the category of slavery. Surely the youngest nation of all, consecrated to freedom in the Declaration of Independence, would not much longer tolerate such a monstrous contradiction of its own professions.

We have seen the rude awakening that was to put an end to these pleasant dreams by the hand of the Calhoun coalition in the first half of the next decade; how King Cotton silenced the last reluctant murmur over every foot of southern soil, and how the power of the north was chained to the car of slavery. In view of the popular intelligence which characterized the people of the north, of free speech, free schools and the swift growth of its free institutions, it seems difficult to believe that twenty-five years of slave domination had to be endured before that agreement of opinion and action could be reached which eventually took the form of the Republican party.

This concert of impulse and action was materially retarded, first of all, by the machinations, the seductions and menaces of the slave power itself. Professional politicians found this task all the more easy because this was a period of extraordinary development, and people were singularly indifferent to politics. Then there were anti-slavery Democrats who imagined that they were still voting for the party of Jefferson, for as has already been stated, the Calhoun slave Democracy masqueraded as "the party of Jefferson and Madison!"

Account must also be taken of Andrew Jackson as a name to conjure by. True, he had been raised, not in Massachusetts, but in the hot-bed of South Carolina slavery. His moral perceptions on the subject were therefore blunted, and he became an easy prey to the designs of Calhoun. But he had gained the most brilliant victory in American history, and he was a firm patriot, quick to resent disloyalty, even to the extent of notifying his old friend Calhoun that if nullifiers were to hang he would give him the head place in the row. A candid study of Andrew Jackson's life leaves the inevitable conviction that, could he have foreseen the tendencies which were to characterize the Jacksonian Democracy in after years, the nature of his administration would have been greatly modified. Nevertheless, the prestige of Jackson entered largely into reluctance in breaking away from the Democratic camp.

The largest single body favorable to abolition continued to act with the Whig party until the complete commitment of that party to the fugitive slave law in 1850 revealed the real tendencies of that organization. Many anti-slavery voters held themselves independent of both parties, preferring to select that candidate of one of the parties who promised most in their favor, and giving him their vote. By this "balance-of-power" method the first anti-slavery men were sent to Congress. In this manner Adams of Massachusetts, Slade of Vermont, Gates of New York and Giddings of Ohio were elected about 1840. These were the first anti-slavery representatives. They were called the "Big Four." In National matters many of the constituents of these congressmen supported an independent candidate for president, knowing that, in that contest, their "balance-of-power" influence would, at least, be only cast for naught.

If the malcontents were slow in reaching a common platform it must not be inferred that, as time passed, the interest waned. The contrary is true.

Some old philosopher has said that when any considerable number of people think alike it shows that none of them are thinking at all. Measured by this rule, even admitting that the people were absorbed in their pioneer battles, and indifferent to politics, there was great mental activity, and woefully little agreement among the thinkers. Naturally there were extremists who ranted "not wisely but too well," and accomplished little.

By newspaper writers of the present day it is not unusual to see the beginnings of anti-slavery effort ascribed to William Lloyd Garrison. As the reader of these papers already knows, the first great wave of hostility to slavery had already accomplished most beneficent results, and partially subsided, before Garrison was heard of, which was about 1830. He had been an anti-slavery editor in Baltimore, but only entered upon the promulgation of his distinctive doctrines in his Boston "Liberator," established in 1831. He was a prominent leader in the first Anti-slavery Society which announced as a principal of action that "We aim to convince all our fellow citizens that slave holding is a heinous crime in the sight of God and should be abandoned; but this society will not countenance resort to physical force even on the part of the oppressed."

The whole Garrison faction adhered to this "non-resistance" absurdity down to the war, and the editor of the "Liberator" had countenanced and advocated many other "isms" which ran directly counter to the popular standards of belief and morality. These included such ultraisms as non-government, perfectionism, anti-clergy, anti-church, anti-marriage, anti-money, spiritualism, etc. Naturally such pure persons would not contribute a cent toward buying Fred Douglas, on the ground that that would be recognizing the right of the master.

In the course of ten years the following of this coterie had dwindled down to a handful. These few, however comprised some very able men whose impulses, eliminated from what were known as the "Boston Vagaries" of that day, were excellent. Between these and the party of Wendell Phillips, which had kept aloof from the anarchistic hallucinations of Garrison and confined its efforts to the crusade against slavery, a sort of compromise was made in 1844 by the adoption of the following platform:

Resolved, That the secession from the present United States Government is the duty of every Abolitionist"; and declaring further that "every voter and

office holder was an abettor of the slaveholder in his sin." From that date forward Wendell Phillips devoted his brilliant oratory to the defense of these ideas. To bring the "Liberator" into alignment with the new change of front it bore the motto: "The United States Constitution: A Covenant with Death and Agreement with Hell," Garrison arguing that it was "the most bloody and Heaven-daring arrangement ever made by man."

These Northern secession ideas were promulgated from extemporized platforms in Northern States, especially in New England, year after year, but with slender success in making converts. The failure so to do was not, however, owing to lack of ability and earnestness. On the other hand the orators of this crusade of extremists comprised such names as Parker Pillsbury, Stephen S. Foster, Henry C. Wright, Abby Kelly and C. C. Burleigh. These went back and forth in the world preaching the wickedness of slavery, it is true, but principally, and before all, the rottenness of the Church and the Bible, and woe to the country parson whose head cropped up in their presence in defense of the faith that was in him. His fate was sealed. In a very short time he saw his own picture painted in blacker colors than those of the slave holder himself. I was present on such an occasion in my boyhood, where Abby was holding forth in a Hicksite Quaker neighborhood. She invited debate in the most courteous terms. The local Methodist minister thought he might set her right in regard to certain allegations that had been made concerning the record of his denomination. Not succeeding so quickly in this as could be desired, and being a plucky man, the debate lasted all the next day and evening. Methodism in its slavery relations, was laid bare as never before. Even the minister seemed to be, and was stunned into silence by the flood of statistics Abby poured forth, never failing to quote her authority. A lawyer who followed the minister in defense of the morality of voting fared no better. In this case as in all similar encounters, statistics and argument was easily coupled with the most impassioned appeals for the poor slave.

It is little to be wondered at that even anti-slavery preachers closed their churches to the missionaries of such a mixed propagandism. But these zealots, one of whom it was claimed, resembled Christ, were not thus to be held back. The more hardy among them would enter at the Sunday service, and

after the preliminary ceremonies, when the sermon was to commence, would rise up and commence: "I stand here to plead the cause of three millions of slaves," etc., etc., Being invited to sit down, and, of course declining to do so, several good deacons would naturally carry him out. These non-resistants always insisted on being carried. Occasionally the deacons would deposit the intruder with the coal and kindling wood under the stairs and lock him in so that the gospel could be preached without further molestation. Sometimes these unwarranted liftings of their safety-valves got these people into jail. But whether in dust-bin or jail, or merely barred out, they posed both ludicrously and lustily for the martyr's crown. Some of the apostles rather objected to the excessive loquacity of certain of their brethren or sisters. On one occasion Abby Kelly, happening to exceed the bounds of propriety, Mr. Garrison and two other brethren themselves carried her out, when she cried out: "I am more blessed than my Lord; he had but one ass to carry him and I have three."

Had these efforts been directed in a line parallel to that in which the great anti-slavery current of the north had commenced to move the effect would no doubt have been considerable. True, slavery was indirectly recognized in the Constitution, but how were these non-voting non-resistants ever to make any more impression on that incident than the fly on the ox's horn? And Presbyterian general assemblies, Methodist conferences and Baptist associations, instead of summarily expelling slave-owners from their communion tables as they would so many thieves and adulterers, had dallied with the monster, reprimanding the practice in mild terms, but deprecating agitation. The only denominations that were squarely on record as against slavery were the Scottish Covenanters, Unitarians, Universalists, Wesleyan Methodists, Free Will Baptists and Free Presbyterians, altogether constituting a small as well as a exceedingly diversified fraction of the body of professing Christians. Now the early pioneers of emancipation and legal abolition were almost always devout Christian men, and to this very fact, to their moral and religious convictions, it is due that they gave their influence against slavery. Seeing that the reform which they so ardently cherished had to actually encounter resistance from their representative ecclesiastical bodies was more than they could stand. It is not to be wondered at that the extremists

among them should give a willing ear to the plausible philanthropy preached by the Boston dreamers.

The more practical and far seeing leaders of anti-slavery sentiment refused to lend themselves to this crusade against the established teachings of religion and morality. James G. Birney author of a book entitled "The American Church the Bulwark of Slavery," remained an Old School Presbyterian to the end of his life. Undoubtedly he felt that he was more powerful for good in the church than against it. In recalling the events of this period, questions of personal duty are thus seen to have been encumbered with much complexity. Certain it is that it was not fairly to be expected that the average moral tone in these bodies would be higher than that of individuals composing them, and certain it is also that the voting ministers in these bodies had to be won to the side of this reform just as other people were; and to their honor, be it said, the great body of their number was ready for action when the proper time was reached.

The ecclesiastical hunkerism of the great Church bodies, dominated as they were by the clerical representatives from the commercial centers, was little regarded by independent ministers. In their case, and in that of church members generally the erratic campaigns of the sharp-tongued apostles of skepticism were, if not positively hurtful, at least barren of any good to the cause of the slave. Certainly it is to the credit of the good sense of the people of that day that they generally turned a deaf ear to Garrison who was reporting accounts of spiritual juggleries in his "Liberator," in which he claimed that he was allowed to talk with angels; and to Henry C. Wright who said, in a letter to the "Liberator," speaking of the Christian's God: "Such a being is to me a devil. What they call 'God' is but an almighty convenience to slave-holders, and warriors, and their allies."

But for brazen impudence all other performances sink out of sight when compared with the claim that Garrison was the father, and the principal agent, of the anti slavery movement; that not the war, but the heel of Garrison, crushed the abomination. Jacksonian Democratic newspapers certainly have some excuse for falling into such an error, for they had persisted so long in printing the sayings and doings of the "Come Outer" clique as the acts of Republicans that they and their readers generally came to believing the "lie well stuck to." But

the same gross absurdity appears, now and then, by implication or otherwise, in English and other prints.

As a matter of fact, as everyone knows, slavery was extinguished by agencies that the Garrison-Phillips disunion faction had fought with all their powers. And this is true whichever horn of the dilemma is taken. For if slavery succeeded by war, as it did, they opposed war. If it was ground between the upper and nether millstone in the patriotic effort to save the Constitution and the Union, they were opposed to both Constitution and Union. That patriotic effort owed an army-corps to Whittier, another to Harriet Beecher Stowe, another to Abraham Lincoln. It owed squadrons and ships to Longfellow and Bryant; to Greeley and Birney; to John Wesley, and Henry Ward Beecher, and Albert Barnes, and Archbishop Hughes --to the Garrison-Phillips combination, nothing; certainly nothing if we post our ledger from their own journal entry as made by Wendell Phillips in his great disunion speech at Boston Music Hall, after secession was under full headway, viz, on Sunday, January 21, 1861. This paragraph will show its entire character:

"Sacrifice anything to keep the slaveholding States in the Union! God forbid! We will rather build a bridge of gold and pay their toll over it, accompany them out with glad noise of trumpets and 'speed the departing guests.' Let them not stand on the order of their going, but go at once! Take the forts, empty our arsenals and sub treasuries, and we will lend them besides jewels of gold and jewels of silver, and Egypt will be glad when they are departed."

Just at that moment, when the rebels were reaching for the throat of the Republic, it strikes one with amazement that such a treasonable appeal would be tolerated in the very cradle of the Union. As a matter of fact the mob was very anxious to lynch Phillips, but the Governor of Massachusetts, the Chief of Police, and a strong force of men stood between him; and danger and protected him from popular fury. Probably they reasoned that the impulses of the erratic factionists were, after all, humanitarian, and that will be the considerate judgment of mankind. Whether, on the whole, they did more good than harm is ordinarily regarded as an open question. Certainly the friends of slavery restriction cannot, without some impatience, recall the stones with which these Northern disunionists blocked their way. The latter were not as one in a hundred, perhaps not one in a thousand;

and yet every Democratic paper in the land was armed with one of their clubs with which to beat back Union men from reaching the Liberty, the Free Soil, and the Republican platform.

Judge William Jay, a prominent anti-slavery man said: "Having sworn to support the constitution of the United States I could not hold communion with any society that is seeking to violate it." The poet Whittier, the friend of everybody, including Garrison, rebuked him severely. He says: "If you fill your paper with 'Grahamism' you defraud your subscribers." Lewis Tappan said: "There is good reason to believe that many professed friends of abolition would be here had they not been afraid of William Lloyd Garrison." Emerson said: "They are not good citizens, not good members of society; unwillingly they bear their part of the public burdens. They do not even like to vote. They filled the world with long words and long beards." They spoke of Lincoln as "The slave hound of Illinois." What wonder that Charles Sumner should say:

"An omnibus load of Boston Abolitionists has done more harm to the anti-slavery cause than all its enemies."

But notwithstanding the vexatiousness of the obstructions thrown in the way of the advancing Republican column by the "come-outers," it is probable that their influence, on the whole, was salutary. Philanthropically considered there are many parallelisms between them and the Prohibitionists of today, and their attitude toward the Republican party was about the same. Both factions cast their eyes across the Red Sea, and the wilderness of the ever toiling, ever changing millions beyond, and, seeing the promised land in all its imaginative bliss and beauty in plain view, propose to leap into it at a single bound. Moses' band did not thus reach the coveted shore, nor did Abraham Lincoln's, nor shall we.

Both factions walk upon clouds, and dream dreams, and from their high moral perches preach and agitate, and agitation brings conviction, and conviction reform. As a practical political force the dreamers are impotent.

CHAPTER IX.

James G. Birney.

No political party will be intrusted with substantial power in the United States which does not profess entire devotion to the Constitution and the laws. We have seen how nullification was crushed by the hand of Jackson; how the Garrison type of disunion at the North was tolerated purely on the ground of its impotence; and how overt treason was put down by the armies of the Union. Neither the Republican party or any of its legitimate predecessors are amenable to any charge which could offend the patriotic instincts of the most ardent friends of the Constitution. True, the early anti-slavery men did publish that one of their objects was the abolition of slavery, but here is the declaration of principles by which they were guided.

First—The admission that each slave state has the exclusive right to legislate on its abolition.

Second—Arguments against slavery.

Third—In a Constitutional way to influence Congress to put an end to the

domestic slave trade (sales of slaves from masters in one state to masters in another state).

Fourth—To abolish slavery in the territories and in the District of Columbia.

Fifth—To prevent the extension of slavery into new states.

This draft of principles was made for the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society by James G. Birney in 1837. For the purpose of showing Mr. Birney's relations to the Constitutional Anti-Slavery party of the United States attention is called to the following table showing the popular vote cast by that party for president down to 1860:

1840—Birney.....	7,100
1844—Birney.....	62,300
1848—V. n. Buren.....	300,000
1852—John P. Hale.....	155,900
1856—Fremont.....	1,341,000
1860—Lincoln.....	1,500,000

The party of freedom and free labor was not established by any one man. Only the blindest of zealots lay claim to any such absurdity. But this much can be said of James G. Birney; early constitutional anti-slavery effort had no more efficient and devoted champion; "that he saw more clearly than any other one man of his times the true path, followed

it more closely, kept the end more steadily in view, and by common recognition of friends and enemies, became, and remained until the sudden close of his public career, the trusted and honored leader of the party of constitutional resistance."

The forward advance of a great popular reform may be presented by a narration of historical sequences; or it may be measured by the votes cast for its representative candidates at popular elections. There are, however, certain phases in every such conflict which can best be comprehended by the illustrations afforded from personal experience. With this fact in view I will endeavor to place under the eye of the reader a brief outline of the life of Mr. Birney, my observations being founded on the book entitled "James G. Birney and His Times," written by his son, Mr. William Birney.

James G. Birney was of Scotch-Irish descent, and therefore had the same race characteristics as Andrew Jackson, John C. Calhoun, Horace Greeley, A. T. Stewart and others who have attained eminence in the New World. His father came to this country a poor boy in 1783, served a commercial apprenticeship in Philadelphia, settled in Danville, Ky., in 1788, where, by dint of true Scotch prudence and persistence, coupled with rare commercial foresight and ability, he achieved large success. After the lapse of twenty-five years he was reputed to be the wealthiest man in Kentucky. He was connected by marriage, or social ties, with the most noted families in Kentucky, comprising in their number the Clays and Breckenridges—Humphrey Marshall, Congressman, foreign Minister and Confederate Major General, was his nephew.

He gave to his only son, James Gillespie Birney, born February 4, 1792, the best opportunities the institutions of the country afforded, including a college education at Princeton and a legal course of three years in the office of Mr. A. J. Dallas, a Philadelphia lawyer of large practice and reputation. Having had the advantage, in his boyhood, of a home life in which industry and a sound morality were diligently inculcated, these rare educational advantages bore their expected fruit—he returned to Kentucky fully equipped for professional life. Shortly after his arrival at home he was invited to join a party of Henry Clay's friends who were escorting that brilliant orator in his canvass for Congress. During the month he was so occupied he made the acquaintance of the most prominent politi-

cal leaders in the state, and his heart went out in admiration for Mr. Clay personally.

In the Kentucky of that day the "star of empire" moved, not westward, but southward. After four years of very successful law practice at Danville, during which period he had been a State Representative, and had also been married, he fell in with the current and moved to Huntsville, Ala., where he resided from 1818 to 1832. During his stay in Alabama he reached the climax of his career as a jurist. He was probably unsurpassed by any lawyer in the South in respect to the importance of his cases and his revenues as a lawyer. He moved back to Danville, Ky., in 1832 at the solicitation of his father, who had become an invalid. About this time his attention was partially occupied by filling the chair of professor of ancient languages in Center College. In 1835 he located in Cincinnati and edited a paper during the next two years. He lived in New York City from 1837 to 1845; in Michigan from 1845 to 1853, and at Eagleswood, N. J., from 1853 to November 25th, 1857, the date of his death.

In this connection a singular coincidence is worthy of note. The Birney's like Southern gentlemen generally, were fond of horseback riding. About 1830 the elder Birney was out one day enjoying his favorite recreation and moving along at a good pace. A gust of wind whirled some object across his path, the horse turned suddenly throwing his rider heavily, breaking several bones. Mr. Birney survived the accident twenty years but never walked again without crutches.

In 1845, not long after Mr. James G. Birney's removal to Michigan, he was, one day, taking an airing on a spirited horse. A prairie chicken rose with a whirr from under the animal's feet, the horse shied and Mr. Birney was hurled to the ground. The severe shock induced nervous paralysis. He lived more than twelve years, but was ever after an invalid and a great sufferer.

The reader will have been impressed by Mr. Birney's frequent change of residence. Being the heir to a large fortune, his practice having been very lucrative, his social qualities having always assured to him a large circle of admiring friends, and his affection for his wife and children having been most ardent, these removals will have to be accounted for upon extraordinary grounds and to these I shall now ask the reader's attention.

The well-to-do citizens of Kentucky were generally slave holders. During Mr. Birney's boyhood the institution in Kentucky was actually characterized by many of those "patriarchal" features which were subsequently so industriously cherished and admired by weak-kneed apologists for the practice. Both Mr. Birney's father and father-in-law were in the category, and a considerable number of chattels, coming from both sides of the house, figured among the wedding presents. He kept the families so acquired together until later on when, having experienced a thorough change of heart on the slavery question, he set them all free and gave them comfortable settlements in life.

This change of heart was a gradual one. Its initial impulses took root during the first anti-slavery agitation in this country. As the reader of previous papers in this series will remember, this agitation was quite as prevalent in the border states as in the north. Most of Mr. Birney's friends and relatives were anti-slavery men from conviction, but slaves were a great convenience, and it was the fashion of the day. Even Patrick Henry said of slaveholders, "Every thinking, honest man rejects it in speculation, but how few practice it from conscientious motives! Would any one believe that I am master of slaves of my own purchase? I am drawn along by the general inconvenience of living without them. I will not, and cannot justify it."

In this first campaign for freedom hostility to slavery was not unpopular. Before political ambition seized upon him, Henry Clay had shown a preference for that side. The Presbyterian denomination, the most powerful in Kentucky, assailed the sin from almost every pulpit. It is nevertheless true that one of the most prominent apologists for the institution with whom Mr. Birney came in contact in his youth was, greatly to this Kentucky student's surprise, the president of Princeton College. There can, however, be no doubt that the seeds of hostility to slavery were sown in his heart and conscience during his youth.

In the field of national politics both parties in Kentucky were under the management of very able leaders. At their head was Henry Clay. The rewards of professional life were very slender as compared with such as were attainable in the newer and more productive states bordering on the Gulf of Mexico. Impelled by these considerations Mr. Birney purchased a cotton plantation in Alabama and fixed his

residence at Huntsville, in that state. His cotton experiment was of short duration. The profitable cultivation of the cotton plant by slave labor necessitated a state of abject discipline to which his slaves had not been accustomed. He could not tolerate the imposition of the harsh restrictions employed by overseers of other plantations. After losing a large share of his fortune in the effort to raise cotton by "patriarchal" slavery, he gave up the business and addicted himself entirely to his law business. In this field he had no difficulty in regaining more money than he had lost, besides placing himself at the head of the bar of North Alabama.

In his new home Mr. Birney had been brought face to face with African slavery in its worst phases, and he became more profoundly impressed than ever with the conviction that his duty lay in ameliorating the condition of the colored race in America. In obedience to this view he supported John Quincy Adams for President. General Jackson was a large property owner in Alabama, and was the most popular man in the State. Mr. Birney understood the situation and accepted the consequences.

Impelled by his sense of duty to the slave, as well as to the general interests of the country, he stumped the state for John Quincy Adams, knowing that such advocacy would extinguish all hope of political preferment in Alabama. As a matter of fact he withdrew from politics after Jackson's election.

He had been twice elected to the State Legislature and had obtained the passage of laws which greatly ameliorated the condition of the slave. With Jackson's election these were promptly repealed. He was also known to be in favor of a gradual emancipation law. These facts, taken in connection with his influence and high standing, pointed to him as a desirable man for the post of agent of the American Colonization Society, an organization in which many anti-slavery men, north and south, had merged their hopes of success. During the next year, 1832-33, he lectured in hundreds of churches. He was generally well received by ministers, being himself a devout member of the Presbyterian Church. As the result of his labors about 150 emancipated slaves were collected at New Orleans and sent to Liberia in the brig Ajax in April, 1833.

Seeing that the gifts of anti-slavery men were frittered away without any adequate result, he shortly afterwards dissolved his connection with the society. He even pre-

pared an open letter taking ground against the colonization scheme as a remedy for slavery. This was published generally throughout the United States and established his reputation in the North as a firm and able friend of the cause of freedom.

About 1832 Mr. Birney conceived the idea that Kentucky was ripe for the adoption of gradual emancipation, needing only well directed organized effort for the accomplishment of so grand a work. He fixed his residence in Danville, where his return was hailed with great satisfaction. He personally knew most of the prominent clergymen and politicians in the State. The record of his labors during the next two years would fill a book. He spoke from hundreds of platforms and lectured from hundreds of pulpits. His pen was busy and his writings were voluminous and powerful. He shrank from no sacrifice of time and means. By the end of the first year this noble effort bore fruit in the promise of approaching success. During the following year the reactionary wave of the newly organized Jackson-Calhoun Democracy rolled over the State and drowned the anti-slavery cause hopelessly. Mr. Birney was even warned against the expediency of establishing an emancipation paper at Danville, a thing which he had hoped to do to aid him in the advocacy of his cause. Following this crisis he resolved to establish his proposed journal at Cincinnati.

Among the names that have occurred in this sketch the reader will easily have recognized those of personages who were politically powerful then, and who subsequently became important props to the Democratic and Whig parties, to the slave power, and even to the rebel Confederacy. A strange locality in which to seek one who was to lay the corner stone of that party which was destined one day to overwhelm the party of slavery in a conflict that should not end until the system of slavery itself had been utterly destroyed.

Mr. Birney had made one extended trip through the free states in the course of which he was everywhere received with the honors due to a distinguished guest. He had spoken upon many northern platforms and was already a recognized leader of constitutional anti-slavery sentiment. He had freed his slaves and settled them comfortably in life. He had made greater sacrifices to the cause than any white citizen of the Republic. In the farther effort to advance the cause to which his life had been consecrated he was now to estab-

lish and conduct a journal on the free soil of Ohio. Surely co-operation and sympathy would hold up the hands of this fervent apostle of free labor and free thought.

When he moved to Cincinnati, in the fall of 1835, it was known that he would publish a paper called the "Philanthropist." The announcement was greeted in the rudest terms by the press generally, and by that of Cincinnati in particular. The most moderate statement was that of Prentice's Louisville Journal: "We have little doubt that his office will be torn down, but we trust that Mr. Birney will receive no personal harm."

He was unable to get a suitable office and the open hostility to him, led as it was by the Mayor and city officials, decided him to get out the paper temporarily at New Richmond, a village twenty miles up the river. He took the ground that "liberty and slavery cannot continue to live in juxtaposition." He argued that such efforts as he was making in the "Philanthropist" were absolutely necessary for the preservation of liberty in the free states. He urged all Abolitionists to vote; "virtuous principles cannot exist without corresponding action." He plead the cause of the slave, but he did not omit the cause of the Constitution and the Union. His practical line of action was to get a balance of power in Congress sufficient to prevent the spread of slavery into new territory.

On January 22, 1836, all the Cincinnati papers except the Gazette contained most inflammatory articles against Mr. Birney personally, calling a meeting for the evening of that day. A perfect mob was in attendance and several harangues strongly redolent with epithets of very unsavory character applied to Mr. Birney had been made when an incident occurred which was thus related by the Gazette on the following morning:

"A good looking man, past the meridian of life, with hair somewhat gray, here arose and said: 'My name is Birney; may I be heard?' The audience was confounded by such a request coming from such a source. Recovering from their surprise at the calm fearlessness of the man who dared to stand unarmed in the midst of his enemies, one cried out, 'Down with him,' others cried 'Kill him,' others cried 'Tar and feather him.' At this stage General Lytle, who had great influence with the mob, rose and at the top of his voice cried, 'Hear before you strike.'"

Once on the platform Mr. Birney quickly exposed the difference between his policy and that of disunion abolition. Having gained the ear of the audience he delivered one of the most powerful appeals in behalf of free speech, and of the Union, ever heard in Cincinnati. He went home unmolested, and the upwards of fifty well-loaded guns he had got in readiness for the mob were not brought into requisition. Personally, he was throughout his life treated with that deference which personal courage always exacts.

In the following March he moved his press to Cincinnati. On July 12 a midnight mob tore out his presses, broke them up and threw them into the river. The mob then held an indignation meeting at which the mayor of the city spoke. He said: "We have done enough for one night. The abolitionists themselves must be convinced by this time what public sentiment is, and that it will not do any longer to disregard, or set it at naught."

Public sympathy flowed in to Birney in large volume. He wrote in November, "The great majority of the people are sound on free discussion and a free press."

During his residence in Cincinnati many persons received their first anti-slavery impulses from him. Among others who frequented his house was a young lawyer named Salmon P. Chase. The latter joined the Liberty party in 1841, having adopted Mr. Birney's opinions on slavery in 1836.

Mr. Birney spent much of his time in lecturing through the State and on several of these occasions had long conferences with Joshua R. Giddings who, a few years later, was elected to Congress. He also published many pamphlets. His scholarly style and moderate tone gained him a large and attentive hearing. Among these documents was one entitled "The American Church, the Bulwark of Slavery." He was a consistent churchman, but that did not prevent him from exposing and smiting down error wherever found. His theory was to build up, and build better, not to tear down and destroy. He visited and counseled with more ministers than any man of his time. He established fraternal relations with editors generally. He visited and labored with nearly all the legislative bodies of the North.

With the work I set out to do in this chapter barely commenced I am compelled to bring these remarks to a conclusion. Obedient to the request of anti-slavery leaders, Mr. Birney fixed his residence in New York where his labors

could be made more effective. During the next five years auxiliary anti-slavery societies increased to the number of nearly two thousand. Through these the documents provided by the Central executive committee, of which he was chairman, got a wide reading. Embarrassments growing out of the Boston disunion abolition propagandism were a constant source of vexation and weakness. His fight was not more against slavery than against secession in the North. His heart was always full of hope for his country—the hope that slavery would be destroyed and the Union preserved by the enlightened use of the freeman's weapon, the ballot. We have already seen that death, induced by an accident, prevented his seeing the fulfillment of both the desires so fervently cherished by him, not by means of the ballot, but by bullets.

The fathers of anti-slavery gave to Mr. Birney all the honors they could bestow. These were few in number. Their honors were freighted with no other recompense than heavy burdens. Twice he was voted for President. These were volunteer tributes to his worth, neither sought nor declined. On the last of these occasions, in 1844, had Mr. Birney's vote of 62,300 been added to Mr. Clay's the latter would have carried New York state and been elected to the Presidency. As a matter of fact, Mr. Birney's support was subtracted from both the Whig and Democratic parties.

That the Birney vote in 1844 was not twice as large was due to a roorback concocted somewhere in Michigan, and which had barely time to become well circulated by election day, thus, in the absence of telegraphs, giving no time for denial or reply. This Borchardism got its widest publication in the New York Tribune, Mr. Greeley being an ardent Clay man. For this performance Mr. Greeley was taken to task by Mr. Birney. As one result of the interview Mr. Greeley gave orders that Mr. Birney's name should never again be printed in his paper. Remembering the conspicuous part taken by the Tribune in the formation and history of the Republican party the reader will easily believe that the persistent compliance with Mr. Greeley's order has had the effect of obscuring the relative merit of Mr. Birney as one of the earliest and staunchest champions of Constitutional Abolition.

Many other men were equally devoted to this great work of rousing the country and uniting the suffrages of the people

against the aggressions of the slave power. Scores of names are worthy to stand side by side with that of James G. Birney, though no other one of those most prominent, came up out of slavery and slave holding. And now that we can boast of a Republic undefiled by slavery,

and a Nation of freemen, it is most meet that we do not lose sight of those noble men who, by their example, by their teachings, and by the consecration of their lives, laid the foundations of that permanent peace which dawned upon the redeemed Union at Appomattox.

CHAPTER X.

The Literature of Freedom.

My purpose, as the reader of this series of articles is well aware, has been to exhibit the causes which gave birth to the Republican party. In the briefest form the party came into existence as a means of defense against the aggressions of the slave power which employed, as its political instrument, the Democratic party. It will be profitable to once more enumerate the milestones that were set up in the history of this gigantic popular struggle, as follows:

First—The Constitution amply guaranteed the rights of citizens, with the single exception that it gave to slaveholders an added enumeration equal to three-fifths of their slaves—it recognized the actual status of slavery. Out of this exception grew the disunion faction of the North.

Second—During the first twenty-five years of the Republic the moral sentiment of the country was against slavery. This feeling was made manifest in the ordinance of 1787, forbidding slavery north of the Ohio; in the emancipation of slaves in the Northern states, and in the abolition of slave importation.

Third—The invention of the cotton gin gave a new and powerful impetus to slavery.

Fourth—The first National conflict was terminated by the Missouri Compromise in 1820, prohibiting slavery in all of the Louisiana purchase except the state of Missouri.

Fifth—The organization of the modern Democratic party in 1830-1836, with the avowed purpose of placing the Federal power in the hands of the slave interest, this being immediately followed by the extinction of free speech in the South.

Sixth—Annexation of Texas and the Mexican war in 1845.

Seventh—Passage of the fugitive-slave law in 1850.

Eighth—Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the Kansas-Nebraska law in 1854.

Ninth—Dred Scott decision, 1857.

Contrasting the Free Soil vote of 155,900, cast for John P. Hale in 1852, and the popular vote of 1,341,000, cast for John C. Fremont in 1856, only four years later, many persons have made haste to ascribe this sudden growth of anti-slavery sentiment entirely to the Kansas-Nebraska outrages of 1854. This is a very shallow view to take. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise was only the sharp point that pricked the cancerous abscess of slavery which had rooted itself deeply into the preceding generation of our political history. The ugly sore had been healed over in 1787, and again in 1820, but the infection remained. It diffused itself through the whole body politic, increasing in virulence from year to year, only to be finally eliminated by the awful surgery of civil war.

That a change of front of majestic sweep was made by northern voters between 1854 and 1860 is very true, and it is not doubtful that the phenomenon was directly precipitated by the Missouri repeal and the Dred Scott decision. I will now ask attention to certain influences of a more general character, which, during the previous quarter of a century, had been at work preparing the moral and intellectual soil of the United States for the growth of that power which was to save the Nation and make us a free people.

Some old philosopher once said: Let me make the ballads of a people and I care not who makes the Nation's laws. In these later times the daily paper, supplemented by railroad and telegraph, has almost succeeded in banishing those conditions of domestic simplicity which once rendered the ballad an implement

of such power. In this respect the general situation has undergone a material change since the years when the inspiring songs of Whittier, of Longfellow and Bryant were first given to the public. These productions depicted slavery as it actually existed. They seized upon its cruel features, its inhumanities, and pictured them in a coloring that deeply impressed the soul. By way of illustration I quote from a few poems, making room for only a few stanzas. This is part of a poem from the pen of Whittier:

THE FAREWELL

OF A VIRGINIA SLAVE MOTHER TO HER DAUGHTERS,
SOLD INTO SLAVERY.

Gone, gone,—sold and gone,
To the rice swamp dank and lone,
Where the slave whip ceases swings,
Where the noisome insect stings,
Where the fever demon strews
Poison with the falling dews,
Where the sickly sunbeams glare
Through the hot and misty air,—
Gone, gone, sold and gone,
To the rice-swamp dank and lone,
From Virginia's hills and waters,—
Woe is me, my stolen daughters!

Gone, gone,—sold and gone,
To the rice swamp dank and lone,
There no mother's eye is near them,
There no mother's ear can hear them,
Never, when the torturing lash
Scours their back with many a gash,
Shall a mother's kindness bless them,
Or a mother's arm caress them.
Gone, gone, etc.

Gone, gone,—sold and gone,
To the rice swamp dank and lone,
Toiling through the weary day,
And at night the spoiler's prey,
O, that they had earlier died,
Sleeping calmly side by side,
Where the tyrant's power is o'er,
And the fetter's gall no more.
Gone, gone, etc.

The following simple picture, drawn by Longfellow, had a wide reading when it first appeared:

THE QUADROON GIRL.

The Slave in the broad lagoon
Lay moored with idle sail;
He waited for the rising moon,
And for the evening gale.

Under the shore his boat was tied
And all her listless crew
Watched the alligator slide
Into the still bayou.

Odors of orange flowers and spice
Reached them from time to time,
Like airs that breathe from Paradise
Upon a world of crime.

The Planter under his roof of thatch,
Smoked thoughtfully and slow;
The Slave's thumb was on the latch,
He seemed in haste to go.

He said, "My ship at anchor rides
In yonder broad lagoon;
I only wait the evening tides,
And the rising of the moon."

Before them, with her face upraised,
In timid attitude,
Like one half curious, half amazed,
A Quadroon maiden stood.

Her eyes were large, and full of light,
Her arms and neck were bare;
No garment she wore but a kirtle bright,
And her own long, raven hair.

And on her lips there played a smile
As holy, meek, and faint,
As lights in some cathedral aisle,
The features of a saint.

"The soil is barren, the farm is old,"
The thoughtful planter said;
Then looked upon the Slave's gold,
And then upon the maid.

His heart within him was at strife
With such accursed gains;
For he knew whose passions grew her life,
Whose blood was in her veins.

But the voice of nature was too weak;
He took the glittering gold!
Then pale as death grew the maiden's cheek,
Her hands as icy cold.

The Slave led her from the door,
He led her by the hand,
To be his slave and paramour
In a strange and distant land!

Here are a few stanzas from another poem of Longfellow's:

In the dark fens of the Dismal Swamp
The hunted negro lay;
He saw the fire of the midnight camp,
And heard at times the horse's tramp,
And a bloodhound's distant bay.

Where the will-o'-the-wisps and glow-worms
shine,

In bullrush and in brake;
Where waving mosses shroud the pine,
And cedar grows, and the poisonous vine
Is spotted like the snake;

A poor old slave, infirm and lame,
Great scars deformed his face;
On his forehead he bore the brand of shame,
And the rag that hid his mangled frame
Were the livery of disgrace.

The following is taken from a poem by William Cullen Bryant:

* * * * * Thou wert enthroned of late,
And they by whom the Nations laws were made,
And they who filled its judgment-seats obeyed
Thy mandate, rigid as the will of fate.

Fierce men at thy right hand,
With gesture of command,
Gave forth the word that none might dare gain-
say;

And grave and reverend ones, who loved thee
not,

Shrank from thy presence in blank dismay
Choked down, unuttered, the rebellious thought;
While meaner crowds, mingling with thy train,
Proved from the book of God, thy right to reign.

Well was thy doom deserved: thou didst not spare
Life's tenderest ties, but cruelly didst part
Husband and wife, and from the mother's heart
Didst wrest her children, deaf to shriek and
Thy inner lair became

The haunt of guilty shame;
Thy lash dropped blood; the murderer at thy
side.

Showed his red hands, nor feared the vengeance
due.

Thou didst sow earth with crimes, and far and
wide,

A harvest of uncounted miseries grew,
Until the measure of thy sins at last
Was full, and then the avenging bolt was cast!

Could the gems of lyric art which dropped from the pens of the anti-slavery poets have been placed under the eyes of all the people the growth of free sentiment would have been greatly hastened. But the slave power was in the ascendancy, and its venal Democratic press, with here and there a rare exception, was hermetically sealed to all literature of that character.

In using the term anti-slavery poets I do not mean to intimate that slavery had any poets. The very terms imply an absurdity. True poetry is the voice of nature; it cannot be the vehicle of that which runs counter to laudable purpose and humane aspiration. And if these songs of freedom, and satires on whips and chains, did fail to reach thousands of eyes of those whose hearts would have given glad lodgment and quick response, they nevertheless obtained a popularity that powerfully widened and strengthened the wave of conviction which took form in the Republican platform of 1856. Can any American repress a feeling of satisfaction at the thought that his own countrymen have blessed mankind with the precious riches of these inspiring tributes to the cause of liberty? And is that not a pardonable pride which exults in the achievements of that political power in the building up of which the grandest poets of the New World must be assigned the first place?

The higher prose literature, such as cleaves to the world's book-shelves, is also inseparably wedded to Liberty. It disdains bondage of every sort. It cannot be conceived of as the handmaid of slavery. The south had no literature, and did not want any. Governor Wise, of Virginia, thanked God that his state had so few newspapers. Either the New York Tribune, or the New York Herald, of 1850, had an aggregate circulation more than double that of all newspapers of Virginia, and many thousands larger than all the papers of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Florida, Georgia and North Carolina combined. In North Carolina one in seven white people could not read; the proportion in Connecticut was one in five hundred and sixty eight.

Other slave holders, however, recognized their weakness and the power of literature and, as usual "called a convention," this time at Savannah. It was declared that "it is important that the South should have a literature of her own to defend her principles and rights." The thought of a literature produced by the fiat of a convention; of a literature proceeding from brains imbruted by

contact with bludgeon and slave hound, was an actual curiosity and provoked nothing but satire. A Southerner wrote of this effort: "Their literature could easily be written on a child's smooth palm and leave space enough for its funeral oration and epitaph."

From first to last the literature that deserved perpetuation has been produced by those who left their testimony against human enslavement. It is true that among these are comprised Jefferson and other eminent Southerners of the early days. Could these men have returned to the South of 1850 in the flesh they would have been pounced upon with bowie knives and pistols. Said a distinguished Representative in Congress: "I challenge any man to show me a single patriot of the Revolutionary war who was in favor of slavery."

The times to which we refer were indeed propitious for the creation of that noble literature which ante-dated, and powerfully aided in building the Republican fabric. Lafayette had said: "I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America if I could have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of slavery."

England had banished slavery from the last of her possessions.

Brougham had said: "Tell me not of rights—talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves. I deny the right; I acknowledge not the property. There is a law above all human enactments, and by that law, unchangeable and eternal, while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they shall reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasies that man can hold property in man."

Curran had said: "No matter what complexion an Indian or an African sun man have burnt upon him; no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down; no matter in what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery, the moment he touches the soil of Britain the altar and the god sink together in the dust."

And Cowper had sung:

"Slaves cannot breathe the air of England; if
their lungs
Receive our air, that moment they are free
They touch our country and their shackles fall."

How must such words as these, uttered about 1833, like double-edged swords, have cut deep wounds into the hearts of the slavery-hating sons of the Great Republic! But the record will show that during the next twenty-five years at least in the North, the intelligence, and scholarship, and consciences of those

not yet debauched by the political slave power, responded to such noble sentiments in a manner not unworthy the freedom-loving lineage of her sons. And it has invariably been the case that where great words were to be spoken some American was at hand and equal to the task. July 4th is inseparably connected with Thomas Jefferson's immortal declaration, a literary composition that is fit to take rank with Brougham's or Curran's masterpieces. Washington has left us his farewell address. When the loyalty of a section was challenged there was a Webster to build a monument of English eloquence more enduring than brass. When the savagery of slavery armed itself against the Union there was a Lincoln to lead the perilous way bearing a banner emblazoned "With Charity for All," and inaugural addresses that will never die. When great victories had been followed by the sunrise of hope there was a Lincoln to stand above the dead and write their epitaph, and the lesson of their sacrifice: "That government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not perish from the earth."

The magnitude of the issues in the era discussed in this chapter enlisted the sympathies and powers of the great writers. They made it our golden age of letters. The names of Holmes and Hawthorne; of Prescott, Dana and Bancroft; of Halleck, Irving and Cooper, were already well above the horizon, but their books breathed forth the spirit of hatred toward every form of oppression.

The newly invented revolving printing presses poured forth a literature inflexibly wedded to freedom and the cause of

the oppressed slave. Books were written that will never die. The burning appeals of Giddings and Parker, of Beecher and Burlingame, of Wade and Lovejoy, of Garrison and Pillsbury, and of the freed slave, Fred Douglas, were heard from the platform. The polished orations of Seward, of Sumner, of Lincoln, of Chase, of Phillips and Birney, were worthy of a classic age. In the realm of fiction and philosophy Harriet Beecher Stowe, Emerson, Hildreth, Lowell, Wavland and Burleigh, and scores of illustrious names, joined the holy crusade. Great newspapers, manned by Greeley's and Raymonds, daily held up mirrors in which freemen could catch glimpses of their vanishing liberties and of the country's shame.

You ask me why I am a Republican. I ask in reply, where is the man who voted against James Buchanan, the Democratic candidate for President in 1856, whose recollections of that and previous years do not fill his soul with exultation in the contemplation of that glorious heritage of political companionship which is his? What an impressive spectacle was that, of the young Republic consecrated to liberty and equality, but forced for years by the lords of the cotton Democracy to bear the burden of slavery, then roused to shame by the throes of an enlightened and repentant conscience, and stirred to action by her gifted sons and daughters, her poets and orators, the founders of American literature, who, with their flaming torches, led the way to the Republican platform of 1856, that national altar where more than a million free men consecrated their suffrages to the cause of free labor in America!

CHAPTER XI.

Birth of the Republican Party.

There still remains the duty of bringing to the reader's attention a class of phenomena which has barely been alluded to, but which exercised a potent influence in thwarting the designs of the slavery-bestridden Democratic party. We have seen in the preceding chapter, how the intellect and conscience of the people was at length awak-

ened to a true sense of our political debasement. To these mental and moral, must now be added certain material forces, in the absence of which our nation must, in all probability, have been held down into the defilement of slavery unto this day.

Notwithstanding the growing preponderance of population and resources

in the North it is nevertheless true that, up to 1860, the end of Buchanan's term, and seventy-two years after the organization of the Government, Southern men had occupied the presidential chair forty-eight years, or more than two-thirds of the time. It is also true that every President from the North, between Jackson and Lincoln, was chosen at the dictation of the South.

Slavery kept a tight grip on the control of the nation until the power was wrenched from its hand by the bayonet. It not only controlled the Government by its facile instrument, the Democratic party, but it had the advantage in territorial area. The free states, in 1850, had an area of 600,000 square miles. The slave states covered 850,000 square miles, a difference in their favor of 250,000 square miles. But other elements of social momentum had been steadily gravitating Northward and Northwestward, which in due time, arrayed themselves behind the popular declarations set forth in the Republican platform of 1856.

For example, the population of New York state at the first census of 1790 was 350,000 inhabitants; that of Virginia was 750,000. In 1850 New York had 3,000,000 and Virginia only 1,500,000, including slaves.

In 1790 the agricultural product of the South exceeded that of the North. In 1850 the hay crop alone, of the North, footed up 142 millions, while the tobacco, cotton, rice, hemp and sugar, the products peculiar to the South, all together amounted to only 125 millions.

The free states had 62,500 public schools, the slave states 18,500. The free states had 15,000 public libraries, the slave states 700. The real and personal property of the free states footed up \$4,100,000,000; of the South, \$2,900,000,000. Slaves, reckoned at \$400 a head, entered into the item last named to the extent of 1,300,000,000, or nearly one-half.

Thus, it will be seen that, regarding the slaves as property, the interest was of formidable proportions. In the South all was solid and secure. A distinguished divine said, addressing the North: "Let your emissaries cross the Potomac and I can promise you their fate will be no less than Haman's." Northern Democrats asked derisively: "If you are opposed to slavery why don't you go where it is?" I have given you the experience of Birney. Garrison was thrown into a Baltimore jail. Elisha P. Lovejoy advocated the cause of the slave in a paper at Alton, Ill., near St. Louis. His office was destroyed four

times. His last office was fired in the night time and, while escaping from the burning building, Mr. Lovejoy received five bullets and fell dead.

The North was overrun by parties on the hunt for fugitives. Some escaped, but many were captured and returned under circumstances of revolting cruelty. A month prior to inauguration of Lincoln a slave woman was seized in Cleveland and returned to Virginia. A trial had been had, and the case was very sad. In the course of the trial Hon. Rufus P. Spalding, the grandfather of our townsman, Judge Day, said:

"While we do this in this city of Cleveland, and permit this poor piece of humanity to be taken peaceably through our streets and upon our railways back to the land of bondage, will not the frantic south stay its parricidal hand? Will not our compromising legislators cry, 'hold! enough? * * * * We are this day offering to the majesty of constitutional law a homage that takes with it a virtual surrender of the finest feelings of our nature; and is, I almost said, a contravention of a Christian's duty to his God.'"

These words well illustrate the painfulness of the issue that had been forced upon the legal and law-abiding citizens of the north by the slave-hunting Democracy.

The shameless and nameless cruelty of slavery on its own soil had been laid bare by "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Its brutalities shocked the world. Wives sold were compelled to accept new partners. Papers on the Gulf coast advertised girls as "nearly white," "very attractive," etc., securing two or three prices. The state of Virginia was the great breeding ground. She had received more for her own flesh and blood, sold to the cotton states, than the whole state would have sold for on the day she seceded from the Union. Northern remonstrance was treated with insult and defiance. Southern Governors published their proclamations offering their rewards of \$5,000; of \$10,000; of \$50,000, and of \$100,000 for the heads or bodies of noted abolitionists. And, stranger than all, every northern town had its Democratic newspaper organ which received its orders from, and obsequiously did the bidding of its Southern masters. Glancing backward over those days the loyalty and patience of the anti-slavery Republicans stands out in bold relief. The remarks of Judge Spalding, quoted above, made on the eve of secession, correctly reflects their situation which was one of supplication rather than defiance. Retribu-

tive justice was soon to test their metal in a struggle for the defense of the Union, precipitated by the slave power, but in which slavery was ground as between the upper and nether millstone.

We have already seen the prodigious strides made by the north in numbers and resources between 1830 and 1850, the multiplication of men of rare intelligence and literary gifts, the great advance made in the cause of popular education. To what cause must we attribute this social advancement? There can be but one answer—freedom, the absence of slavery. Take the conduct of emigrants as an illustration. The influx was very heavy, and emigrants avoided slave states as if by instinct. Castle Garden, the receiving station of emigrants, was closed only a few months since. Its records showed that nearly ten millions of foreigners had fixed their homes in America. Of these 97,000 settled in New York state; 231 in Virginia; Michigan had received 12,000; Arkansas 325, and so on. As a matter of fact the division of civic functions in the slave states presented few attractions to poor white settlers. This division was thus made by a Southern writer in 1856: "The slaves are cowards; the slaveholders are tyrants; the poor whites are lick-spittles. The slaves are pitiable; the slave-holders are detestable; the poor whites are contemptible."

Prior to 1850 the great forces which dominate in modern American life had had little extension as compared with the spectacle now presented. But the eggs had been hatched. The Erie canal had opened a waterway to the great West. Fulton's invention was bearing large fruit in facilitating the exchanges of commerce. The inventions of Hoe, of Howe and of Goodyear added millions upon millions. Reapers and mowers brought the prairie states into subjection. Steamships crossed the Atlantic in 1838. And finally Morse's telegraph, in 1844, annihilated distance in the transmission of intelligence. But the great factor in the development of both agricultural and mechanical resources is the railroad. Of railways there were twenty-three miles in operation already in 1830; 1,000 miles in 1835; 2,000 miles in 1840; and the mileage then doubled every five years until 1860. Now, by 1850, the value of manufacturing capital in the Free States had reached the sum of 430 millions; in the Slave States only 95 millions. The North had 3,700 miles of canals; the South only 1,000. The North had 18,000 miles of railroads; the South only 7,000 miles.

The reader has by this time fully apprehended the nature of the material reasons for the preponderance of the North alluded to at the beginning of this chapter. The North had maintained its fealty to the Declaration of Independence; its reward was prosperity. The South renounced Republican equality; its reward was stagnation. The sentiment of the civilized world denounced slavery; slaveholders had put their section out of harmony with the spirit of the age. Invention, immigration, expansion rained prosperity on the North; the South was not sharing it. Something must be done.

The busy North could give little attention to politics. Slaveholders did no business. They slurred Northern men, even Representatives in Congress, as "greasy mechanics," as "the mudsills of society." They struck down Charles Sumner in the Senate chamber with a budgeon. They were not numerous but a common interest united them solidly. Slave owners in 1830, numbered only 186,000. The owners of as many as 100 slaves footed up only 6,000. These six thousand men lorded it over the Republic and its thirty millions of people. They had leisure, education, wealth and great ability. They addicted themselves to politics from the cradle. Their section had thirty Senators; the north thirty-two; Slavery had all the Senators from both sections except ten, viz: Fessenden and Hamlin, of Maine; Sumner, of Massachusetts; Foot, of Vermont; Smith, of Connecticut; Seward and Fish, of New York; Chase and Wade, of Ohio; and Dodge, of Wisconsin. Their Democratic candidate, Franklin Pierce, had just carried every state in the Union but four. The lords of the lash were still supreme, but in the colder Northern sky could be seen a gathering cloud. There were signs of a gathering storm.

Birney, the frank, far-seeing and fearless philanthropist, had already said: "Slavery and freedom cannot continue to live in juxtaposition." But Lincoln, the statesman, had not yet said: "I do not believe that this government can continue to exist half slave and half free." Nor had Seward, the political philosopher, yet made his Rochester speech containing his terse declaration: "It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become entirely a slave holding nation, or a free labor nation." But the lords of slavery were quite as able to interpret the tendencies of the age as the apostles of freedom.

They had smiled at the ripple in Northern sentiment made by the hidden rock, as shown by the "Liberty" party vote for Birney in 1840 and 1844. Indifference changed to interest, and then to anger, as the Free Labor vote waxed in importance. Already they feared the oncoming of that moral current which was to dash portentously over the rocks in 1856, and thence roll onward with resistless power to the Niagara of 1860. Something must be done.

The first imperative need of slavery, in order to enable it to cope with free labor in the race for power, was more territory. By the Missouri Compromise and the Ordinance of 1787 all the national area north of Arkansas and northwest of the Ohio river, belonged to free labor. True, there was no written law against slavery in the Mexican acquisition west of Texas. But Daniel Webster, who, in his latter days gave his great influence and abilities in defence of slavery, made a captious plea for it on the ground that slavery was not adapted to the Mexican territory. In opposing the Wilmot Proviso he said that it was "An effort to debar slaveholding on snowy crags and arid deserts where no slave could be subsisted—a super-servicable attempt to re-enact the laws of God."

If New Mexico offered meagre temptations to settlers, such was far from being the case with the new territory west of Missouri and Iowa. Guided by the "Star of Empire" a strong pioneer force had already invaded this region; along with the rest a number of slaveholders with their slaves, in defiance of the established law. Taking the hint from this incident, and having well-merited confidence in the trustworthiness of its northern Democratic allies, the slave power decided upon attempting a revolutionary measure. The leaders resolved to throw open to slavery all the territory that had been consecrated to free labor by law. Since the days of Jackson they had had things their own way. They would force slavery upon the whole Union, by law if possible; if not by the sword. The accomplishment of the first was prevented by the Republican party; of the last by the Union army.

The entering wedge was the "Kansas-Nebraska" bill, introduced into Congress in December, 1853. The terms of this bill organized the territories of Kansas and Nebraska and authorized the erection of territorial governments. The clause in regard to slavery was as follows: "Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prevent the people of

said Territory from passing such laws, in relation to the institution of slavery, as they may deem best adapted to their locality." The debate was long and heated. Democrats indulged in a vast amount of sophistry to show that the violation of the old compacts was not so flagrant after all. No style of argumentation was left untried. Said Badger, of North Carolina: "Is it not hard, if I choose to emigrate to Kansas, that I should be forbidden to take my old mammy [slave nurse] along with me?" To which Senator Wade, of Ohio, replied: "We have not the least objection to the Senator's taking his old mammy along with him to Kansas. We only insist that he shall not be empowered to sell her after taking her there."

For the most part the fire-eaters kept in the background, thus compelling Northern Democrats to shoulder the shame of defending the iniquity. Stephen A. Douglas was their ablest debater, and came to be known as the great champion of "Squatter Sovereignty." During this memorable debate the few Free Soil members of Congress did most noble service to the cause of freedom by bringing to the attention of the country the present and ultimate designs of the slave power upon the liberties and laws of the Nation.

The bill passed the House by a vote of 113 to 110. Of the majority forty-four votes were from the free states—all Democrats. Nine Southerners voted against it. These were speedily dropped from the rolls of Democratic candidates for office. The Senate passed the measure by a vote of 35 yeas to 13 nays. The law was immediately approved by President Pierce and the iniquity was consummated.

The South expected an easy conquest of Kansas, as slavery had already effected a small lodgment there. It mattered little that anti-slavery settlers were five to one. "Border Ruffians" came in from Missouri and carried the first election. At one poll 604 votes were cast, of which only twenty were settlers. At Lawrence there were 369 voters in all—the return was 781 Democratic, and 253 Free Soil. And so on. Governor Reeder, himself appointed by President Pierce, set aside the election in all but six districts. Slavery soon ousted Reeder. The old tactics of barbarism was brought into play. The organ of the Administration at A'chison said: "We can tell the impertinent scoundrels of the Tribune that they may exhaust an ocean of ink; their Emigrant Aid Societies spend their millions and billions;

their representatives in Congress spout their heretical theories, and His Excellency appoint Abolitionist after Free Soiler as our Governor, yet we will continue to lynch and hang, tar and feather and drown, every white livered abolitionist who dares to pollute our soil." Every one is familiar with this Kansas struggle. The Democrats found that the Atchison program was one that two could play at. The struggle ended long before the election of Lincoln by a peace assured by free state votes and free state bayonets, and by Kansas, with the approval of a Democratic Governor, demanding admission as a free state. The Democratic Senate turned a deaf ear, and Kansas was only admitted after Lincoln's election. This was the first fruit of the repeal of the Missouri compromise. Slavery felt that there was only one resource left—the sword.

The tumult at the North over the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act was great. But the Northern Democracy was as thoroughly committed to the perpetration of the crime as that of the South. The Northern leader was Stephen A. Douglas, who had gone so far that retreat was impossible; therefore when their convention in 1856 was held Douglas was shoved aside to make room for a presidential candidate of less independence, and one that was known to be better adapted to their designs. They selected James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania who, before his term had expired, had permitted all the serviceable arms in the country to be stored in Southern arsenals; in fact had seen the rebellion safely launched upon its career, thus insuring the absolute correctness of its Democratic lineage. J. C. Breckinridge, afterwards a Confederate general, was their nominee for Vice President. The platform adopted said: "We recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the Slavery question."

The slave power had now been in almost undisputed possession of the government for twenty-eight years. Through the mechanism of the Democratic party a few thousand slave-holders ruled the commonwealth. They made presidents, home and foreign ministers, and all officials from judges of the Supreme Court down to the pettiest postmaster. It was a slave-holding nation. They had given their own interpretation to Constitution and laws. And now even these barriers were to be

thrown down so that no foot of soil should remain sacred to freedom. The south was solid. All hope for the cause of free labor must come from the north. In that section the Colonization Society, representing the milder form of protest against slavery, had dwindled into a humane farce. The rabid element, which denounced the Constitution as a compact with hell, stood openly on the platform of disunion. The Liberty party had been merged into the Free Soil party, and, in 1854, the latter went by the name of the Anti-Nebraska party. It had already carried a number of the state elections in that year, and in 1855.

In the year 1856 someone proposed that the new political party, the first rays of whose coming were already flashing across the continent, be called the "Republican" party. The proposition met with large favor. A convention was called to meet in Pittsburgh on February 22—the birthday of Washington and the birthday of the Republican party. Resolutions were passed christening the new party and fixing upon Philadelphia, June 17, for the national convention. When the day arrived delegates were present from every northern state. They comprised in their number names that are threads of gold in the fabric of our national history. The platform breathed fidelity to the Constitution and to free labor. It "resolved" that:

"As our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it, for the purpose of establishing slavery in any territory in the United States. It is both the right and duty of Congress to prohibit in the territories those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery."

Thus the second Declaration of Independence, and in favor of human rights, was proclaimed, like the first, from the city of Philadelphia. The convention nominated John C. Fremont, of California, for President, and William L. Dayton, of New Jersey, for Vice President. Abraham Lincoln received 110 out of 369 votes for Vice President.

From the election of Jackson to 1856 no presidential elector of anti-slavery proclivities had ever been elected from any state; not one. In that year the Republicans carried all the New England States, and New York, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa, giving Gen.

Fremont 114 out of 288 electoral votes. Buchanan had a majority of 60, the last triumph of slavery at a National election.

Slavery was yet to outrage the decencies of civilization by the Dred Scott infamy, pronounced by the mouth of its Democratic Chief Justice in 1857; it was yet to win victories in its war against the Union; but on January 1st, 1863 its doom was sealed by the Emancipation Proclamation; on July 4th, 1863 it was brought to bay at Gettysburg and Vicksburg; and in April, 1865, the horrid monster was stricken lifeless to the dust.

In 1860 Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States, receiv-

ing 180 out of 303 electoral votes. With this event, and the extinction of slavery by the war, the task I had proposed to myself, viz : the presentation in brief outline, but in as consecutive form as possible, of those causes which brought the Republican party into existence, is finished. The New America, now in deed and in truth the "land of the free and the home of the brave" dates its beginning from April, 1865. To the saved and redeemed Nation it comes as the priceless gift of those moral and patriotic forces whose embodiment is known to the world as the National Republican Party.

APPENDIX.

LETTER FROM MR. PARKER PILLSBURY.

At the solicitation of a friend Mr. Parker Pillsbury, the most distinguished survivor of the Garrisonian leaders, prepared the following criticism on Chapter VIII.

CONCORD, N. H., June 20, 1890.

My Dear Sir: You ask me an impossibility. My swords are all beaten into plow-shares and my spears into pruning hooks. Oliver Johnson was our last, bravest, best in the warfare you would wage. But he like the Elder Napoleon,

"He sleeps his last sleep,
He has fought his last battle,
And no sound shall awake him to glory again."

He knows nothing correctly of anti-slavery history. He has mixed and muddled both persons and things. Some of his statements are flat, some foolish, some false, absolutely. And he pretends to write authentic history. No wonder Bonaparte asked in disgust "What is history?" and answered for himself: "Nothing but fable generally accepted." Fortunately this hero's fables will not be "generally accepted." Unless among those of his own intellectual and moral measurement.

Abby Kelly, he exalts as superior in argument to the whole Methodist church. As she was; for the reason that she had the truth, the whole truth on her side. But before he had done with her he had her such an insufferable babbler that she had to be carried out of the meeting by Garrison himself, assisted by "two other brethren!" I think the father of lies himself would pay premium for such a stunner like that in any market.

I remember one day that an insane woman was carried kindly and tenderly out of our convention by a couple of men,

but Mr. Garrison was not one of them. Nor was her name Abby Kelley.

Probably had Josiah Hartzell read his eighth chapter a second time he would have withheld it. Certainly he would, had he known the facts of anti-slavery history and been even decently honest. The charges heaped upon Garrison and his friends of no government sub-distinguished into non-resistance, perfectionism, anti-clergy, anti-Sabbath, anti-Bible, and I know not what else continued till those who uttered them were almost as tired of them as was the world that had to hear or read them. And they have about the same effect on the anti-slavery cause and its advocates as the buzz of locusts or squeak of field mice when the steam harvester goes thundering by.

It is true, as friend Hartzell says, that Garrison was the first to announce that "slave holding is a heinous sin in the sight of God and should be abandoned," was Garrison's demand. And till that demand was made by him it is true to say nothing effective was ever done in the country—was ever done to overthrow the crime and curse. And as Garrison was the first to challenge the monster to mortal combat, so he was in at the death. Whether his "coterie" of followers were few or many, or whatever their weapons of warfare, they held the field and were as vigorous and active and as much dreaded and hated by the slave power north and south, as at any time during

the whole conflict. And slavery was not at any time taunted as not knowing who were its most dangerous foes. Senators Sumner, Wade and Wilson, Giddings and Governor Andrews and many other leading Republicans often admitted to Garrison that without the primary work on the mind and conscience of the people they could do nothing. And the President himself, and the whole War Department would have greatly deplored the loss of Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Abby Kelley, Foster or Charles C. Burleigh from their high vantage ground of moral, peaceful and religious agitation, which they continued to hold even after the storming of Ft. Sumter and the committal of the whole terrible problem to the arbitrament of the sword.

Nor was Garrison forgotten by the Nation and Government after the conquest closed with the surrender of the last rebel and the emancipation of the last slave. For when the National flag was to be restored on Ft. Sumter as sign and seal that peace was restored, and freedom, not slavery, had triumphed; and that "liberty and union were again one" and now "one and inseparable," who but the same Garrison was invited

among the nation's most honored guests to grace the glad occasion and assist in the ever memorable ceremonies of that proud day?

Not one of all his defamers and vilifiers north or south was so distinguished. I think not one ever has been since, on any similar occasion.

But high consideration for Mr. Garrison continued. Soon an elegant residence in one of the handsome suburbs of Boston was purchased for him, and presented to him, and his heirs and assigns forever. And the subscription proceeded until thirty-two thousand dollars in cash crowned the generous offering. And now his statue in bronze graces one of the most commodious sites in the proudest avenue of Boston, this also a free will offering of his friends, to transmit his memory and worth down to remote posterity. And when he ascended to his rest and reward, there attended him the gratitude and joy of four million slaves whom he lived to see redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled, through a mighty enterprise which he inaugurated and attended to its final triumph.

Sincerely and truly yours,

PARKER PILLSBURY.

MR. HARTZELL'S REPLY TO MR. PILLSBURY.

EDITOR REPOSITORY: Your paper of last evening contains an article from Mr. Parker Pillsbury which derives such value as it may possess from the historical reminiscences that are revived by the name of the author.

The article partakes largely of the nature of a scold. He affects to doubt my statements, and agrees with Napoleon that "history is nothing but fable generally accepted." This view does not, however, deter him from devoting the most of his letter to a vindication of Garrison. His idea, therefore, is that good history is that which coincides with one's own beliefs, but failing in that it is fable.

He says that admirers gave Garrison a house and a statue. I have seen a beautiful statue erected in honor of Major Andre. Only the other day a superb memorial to R. E. Lee was unveiled at Richmond. Statues prove nothing.

He says that Garrison was invited to assist in restoring the flag at Fort Sumter. He thinks that all the honor derived from such invitation was due to Garrison. But there are those who think that the reflected honor upon the magnanimity of the man who had been denounced by the Garrisonians as "the slave-hound of Illinois," upon the man who had charity for all, was the greatest and brightest.

Other former anti-slavery Presidents have taken ex-slaveholders and ex-Confederates into their cabinets, and with general approval. These post-bellum performances prove nothing. Slavery was gone, and Lincoln, Garrison and Longstreet, honest and true men who had been estranged by errors of judgment could, and naturally did, come together upon the same platform.

I am still unable to see what proper bearing the subsequent honors paid to

Mr. Garrison has in abatement of these historical truths:

First—The Republican party was a Union and constitutional anti-slavery party.

Second—It had as antagonists, the slave power and the disunion abolitionists.

The correctness of these propositions needs no argument. Representatives of the slave power acknowledge their error and accept the situation. The northern disunionists have generally done likewise and are zealous members of the Republican party. Mr. Pillsbury seems to be an exception.

He opposes my views of this history. There can be no objection to that. Men do not agree and writers expect criticism.

He slurs my motives and honesty. That part he might have omitted. I shall make no retort in kind. It is hard to break loose from an old habit. With these old disunionists every disagreement with their views, both in politics and religion, was alleged to be prompted by dishonesty and corruption.

On the other hand voting anti-slavery men generally accredited the disunion extremists with purity of motive. Their unselfishness was complete; their sacrifices were great. Mr. Pillsbury himself was one of the ablest of their number. Forty years ago he was one of the most brilliant orators on the American platform. He has spoken frequently in this county and those who were privileged to hear him, the writer among the rest, remember him with feelings of

warmest admiration. No heresy was ever more fortunate in the character and zeal of its propagandists than that of the Northern disunionists.

About that time he published a small work entitled "The Church as It Is; or, the Forlorn Hope of Slavery." In 1883 a larger work appeared from his pen entitled "The Acts of the Anti-Slavery Apostles." This is probably the best history of the Garrisonian movement, from the standpoint of one of its own apostles, that can be obtained.

No student can hope to attain an unbiased and satisfactory comprehension of the history to which these articles refer without a careful reading of both sides. For this reason, and with the desire of aiding persons who are disposed to extend their investigations in this field I take pleasure in naming the books written by Mr. Pillsbury.

After reading these books, and all the other available works treating on the same subject, and considering the same in the light of subsequent events, I can safely leave the reader to judge of the probable correctness of Mr. Pillsbury's assertions as to my ignorance and misapprehension of the subject. It may possibly be found that these statements of his are devoid of other authority than such as attaches to his personal dictum, which so far, and fortunately for the good of his country and humanity, has been of very small proportions.

JOSIAH HARTZELL.

BIRNEY VS. PILLSBURY.

Letter from Hon. Wm. Birney to Mr. Josiah Hartzell.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 28, 1890.
Mr. Josiah Hartzell:

Dear Sir:—I have read with interest and cordial sympathy the eighth and ninth chapters of your work, as published in the Repository. Your statements are clear and generally accurate. The mistake of confounding Abby Kelly with Abby Folsom, for which Mr. Pillsbury rates you so sharply, is one many have made before you, and is trivial.

Mr. Pillsbury ranks the late Oliver Johnson as "our last, bravest, best" defender of Garrisonianism. This is true. No one can take his place. His skill in all the arts, good and bad, of controversy,

his determination to win, his brilliant daring in assertion, and his readiness and ability as a writer made him a formidable attorney for a desperate cause. Though not equal to Phillips, he was superior to Garrison. For a quarter of a century he filled the American press with his laudations of the Garrisonian clique, writing on the subject for every paper that would admit his articles. His opponents were either overwhelmed by his assumptions or driven from the field by his vituperations. No doubt, he did more than any other man to becloud the truth of anti-slavery history. Whether

his thesis was to prove himself and Garrison better Christians than the orthodox, or that free thinkers abolished slavery and the church sustained it, he made an argument plausible enough to perplex the ignorant.

Mr. Pillsbury adopts Oliver Johnson's tone and assertions, but is evidently not able to sustain the first or maintain the last. He pooh-poohs the charges of no government, &c., "heaped" upon Garrison and his friends, but does not answer the proofs taken from their writings. He falsely attributes to you the assertion "that Garrison was the first to announce that slaveholding is a heinous sin," etc., and follows with the assertion that "Garrison was the first to challenge the monster to mortal combat."

This ignores all previous history. Compare the statement with the facts. Garrison did not begin his career until September, 1829. In 1824 the voters of Illinois rejected slavery; in 1827 New York abolished it; and Mexico in 1829. James Gilliland, Benjamin Lundy, John Rankin, Dyer Burgess, Thomas Morris, William Dickey, James H. Dickey, Samuel Cr. thers, the Chillicothe Presbytery and hosts of other good and true men in Ohio had preached immediate abolition long before the name of Garrison was heard of. There were 100 abolition societies south of Mason and Dixon's line before that time. Mr. Pillsbury's assertions imply that he has not read the history of his country.

He claims indirectly that the Garrisonians did the "primary work on the mind and conscience of the people." Is this true? Part of this "primary work" was to study out, polish up and use such phrases as: "A slave-breeding, slaveholding Christ;" "The church a brotherhood of thieves;" "The Christian's God a devil;" "It is better for a town to have a hundred brothels than one church;" "The constitution an agreement with hell;" "Lincoln, the slavehound of Illinois;" (See their phrases collected by Eli Thayer's "Kansas Crusade.")

I have heard Senators Sherman, Wade, and Wilson talk of the Garrisonians and I call for proof that they ever attributed good results to the Garrisonian teachings.

I deny, too, that Lincoln and Stanton "would have greatly deplored the loss of Garrison," etc.; and that Garrison was invited "to assist in the ever memorable ceremonies," of reboisting the Union flag on Fort Sumter. It is true that by the special request of an ex-member of parliament, and by extraordinary man-

agement on the part of one of Garrison's friends, he got a free pass to Charleston on a Government vessel, but he did not assist in the ceremonies. He got up a meeting of negroes in the town and spoke at it with his usual vanity; but the government had nothing to do with that.

So far as Garrison's reputation is concerned, he was lucky in having educated sons, and Henry Villard, the railroad millionaire, for a son-in-law. This, and the city pride of Boston, may account for the statue and many other things.

Will you allow me to differ respectfully from your "Prohibition Parallelism?" So far as state action is concerned, the Prohibitionists advocate nothing contrary to the constitution and laws. The courts have frequently decided this. Their method may not be the most expedient, but it is not unlawful. The Prohibitionists do not seek their ends by the overthrow of the constitution, the government, the law and the church. They are not anarchists, or even secessionists.

I write in haste and amid the interruption of business.

Yours truly,
WILLIAM BIRNEY.

STANDS CORRECTED. ➤

EDITOR REPOSITORY: In the course of a late communication to you having for its object the vindication of my views from the aspersions of Mr. Parker Pillsbury, the latter's statement of the circumstances accounting for Mr. Garrison's presence at the reboisting of the national flag at Fort Sumter was accepted as correct. But according to the account of Mr. William Birney, as contained in his letter, the description of Mr. Pillsbury left a very inaccurate impression of the affair.

Mr. Birney's high standing, and his intimate relations with Republican leadership ever since the organization of the party, give to his version of the incident a weight of authority which is not likely to be questioned.

Mr. Birney is the only surviving son of James G. Birney, the most conspicuous and influential pioneer of that later anti-slavery movement which chrystallized itself into the form of the Republican party. His writings have thrown a flood of light upon the incidents attending the early struggles of the free-labor element, and they are universally accepted by the independent press and writers of the country as the most valuable of recent contributions to the political history of the United States.

JOSIAH HARTZELL.

